

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, January, 1900.

OLD FRENCH GRAMMAR.

USE OF *le, la, les* BEFORE *me, te, nous, vous, lui, leur* IN OLD FRENCH.

I.

EXAMPLES OF OCCURRENCES IN TEXTS EXAMINED.

AFTER a full list of examples has been given a résumé will follow, indicating the number of times a given phenomenon is found in each author examined.

A. Before the verb.

1. *le, la, les* standing immediately before *me, te, nous, vous*:

Po ço l'vos di (A, p. 139. For explanation of capitals A, B, C, etc., compare col. 2).

Se Franceis le me dient, donc l'otreierai bien (B, l. 23).

Ou tolu le nos ont maufe (D, l. 1131).

Dunc la me ceint li gentilz reis, li niagnes (C, l. 2321).

Jeo nel te puis guereduner (E, XX, 9).

Je le vos conterai (F, 22, 25).

Le ceur le me dist (G, l. 163).

Jel vos di sans doter (H, l. 271).

Mes Sarrazin le te retodront tot (I, l. 433).

Je le vos dirai (J, l. 6, 9).

Véoir la m'estuet (K, l. 632).

Nel vus puis sanz lermes dire (L, p. 25).

Le te rendray (N, l. 105).

Je le te dirai (O, l. 343).

Jel vos creant (P, l. 1147).

Je le te veil donner (Q, l. 200).

Ainsi le nous distrent (S, p. 18).

Le vous monstrerai (T, p. 7).

Et le m'aporta la journée (V, XLIII, 14).

Le m'a dit et je le croy (W, p. 2).

Amy, je le vous vueil bien dire (X, l. 142).

Je le vous veulx prouver par escripture (Y, p. 151).

Nous le vous amenons depouillé des ses armes (AA, p. 158).

2. *me, te, nous, vous* standing immediately before *le, la, les*:

Sire, dist Guenes, me l'cuvient à souffrir (C, l. 456).¹

Me les rendrés (H, l. 2813).

Sire, bien vos le os et dire et fiancier (J, I, 58, 47).²

Il te le cuvient desservir (O, l. 1022).

Je ne sçay qui me le deffant (U, p. 164).³

Et elle me l'octroye (W, p. 4).⁴

Je ne te le daignerois dire (Y, p. 6).

Dieu sçait de quel bon judgement ils vous le partissent (Z, I, 19, 90).

Et nul autre que toi ne me la peut apprendre (AA, p. 19).

Dès qu'un beau visage me le demande (BB, p. 87).

Je vous la révèle (Cf. Phèdre, l. 318).

Il me les avait racontés (DD, p. 14).

3. *Le, la, les* standing immediately before *lui* and *leur*:

Ainz preiet Deu qued il le lor pardoint (A, p. 152).⁵

Je la luy donne (V, XVIII, 4).

Je le luy donne (W, p. 105).⁶

Ilz ont bon temps, Dieu le leur sauve (X, l. 490).

Et les luy mettez en la bouche (Y, p. 515).

Celuy qui les luy monstreroit (Z, I, 3, 22).⁷

Nul n'a su le lui ravir (DD, p. 7).

B. After the verb.

1. *le, la, les* standing immediately before *moi, nous, lui, leur* in imperative constructions:⁸

Donnez la moy (V, LXXIV, 22).

Feites le nos savoir, biaux sire (D, l. 603).

Vendons-le-leur (Whitney's *Practical French Grammar*. New York, 1887, p. 105).

II.

RÉSUMÉ.

The following table gives a résumé of the occurrences noted above. The capital letters

¹ Cf. l. 3593.

² Cf. I, 58.4; III, 53.15. ³ Cf. p. 73. ⁴ Cf. pp. 4, 77.

⁵ Cf. pp. 144, 152. ⁶ Cf. p. 141.

⁷ Cf. I, 24, 188; I, 25, 229.

⁸ Only one example of each of the pronominal combinations found with imperatives will be cited here, since in both Old and Modern French the direct object is always placed before the indirect in such combinations.

represent the authors and the numerals placed to the right represent the number of times a given construction occurs in the author mentioned. If no numeral is expressed, the construction occurs only once in the text indicated.

A. *Before the verb.*

1. *le, la, les* standing immediately before *me, te, nous, vous*: A rule,⁹ B rule, C17, D rule, E rule, F rule, G rule, H21, I rule, J32, K rule, L rule, M rule, N rule, O6, P rule, Q rule, S rule, T rule, V rule, W12, X rule, Y11, AA.

2. *me, te, nous, vous* standing immediately before *le, la, les*: C4, H, J2, O, W3, Y17, Z rule, AA11, BB rule, CC rule, DD rule.

3. *le, la, les* standing immediately before *lui, leur*: A2, V, W2, X, Y, Z5, DD2.

B. *After the verb.*

1. *le, la, les* always stand before *moi, nous, lui, leur* in imperative constructions.

III.

HISTORICAL TREATMENT.

1. The monographs and grammars that I have consulted merely mention the construction in question without attempting any explanation.¹⁰

IV.

ORIGIN OF THE USE OF THE DIRECT¹¹ BEFORE THE INDIRECT OBJECT IN PROCLITIC POSITION IN THE OLD-FRENCH EXPRESSIONS *il le me dira; il le te dira; il le lui dira*.¹²

These constructions are survivals of the

⁹ "Rule" indicates that the construction given is found without variants in the author mentioned.

¹⁰ Cf. Diez, *Grammatik der Romanischen Sprachen*, Bonn, 1889, Vol. III, p. 473; Suchier, *Le Français et le Provençal*, Paris, 1891, p. 195; Haase, *Syntaxe Française du XVII. Siècle* (traduite par M. Obert), Paris, 1898, p. 436; Étienne, *Essai de Grammaire de l'Ancien Français* (IX-XIV. Siècle), Paris, 1895, p. 345; MM. G. Paris et E. Langlois, *Chrestomathie du Moyen Âge*, Paris, 1897, LXXXVII, 257; Bernhard Völcker, *Die Wortstellung in den Ältesten Französischen Sprachdenkmälern*, Altenburg, 1882, p. 37; Jules Le Coultre, *De l'Ordre des Mots dans Chrestien de Troyes*, Dresde, 1875, p. 43; L. Clédat, *Grammaire Élémentaire de la Vieille Langue Française*, Paris, 1885, 684; Darmesteter et Hatzfeld, *Le Seizième Siècle en France*, Paris, 1889, § 331).

¹¹ Cf. C, l. 1716:

Quant jo l' *vous* dis, cumpainz, *vous* ne le deignastes.

¹² For brevity, *le me* will be used when referring to any proclitic combination of a first and third personal form. Likewise *le te* and *le lui* will be used to include all combinations of the second with a third person, and of a third person with a third respectively.

Latin. When in Latin a pronoun of the third person and one of the first or second person were placed immediately before the verb by which they were governed two constructions were possible.¹³ Sometimes the indirect¹⁴ object was placed before the direct, and sometimes the direct¹⁵ object was put first. Of these two constructions Old French adopted the latter¹⁶ almost to the exclusion of the former,¹⁷ while in Old Italian¹⁸ and Old Spanish¹⁹ it was the rule to place the indirect object before the direct.²⁰ The personal order of the pronouns in both cases has a Latin basis, but one naturally asks why the Italian and Spanish selected one construction and the French another. This difference in arrangement may have been due to the different basis that each took as a point of departure in determining the position of the pronouns in question. In Old French this basis seems to have been *case relation*, which resulted in the use of the direct²¹ before the indirect object, while in Spanish²² and Italian²³ the basis of arrangement was *personal priority*, or a desire that the pronouns of the first and second persons shall precede the third. Favoring the supposition that Old French did prefer

¹³ Cf. Terence, *Eunuchus*, l. 1053:

Mihi illam laudas?

Compare also Terence, *Andria*, l. 675:

Ego, Pamphile, *hoc tibi pro servitio debeo.*

¹⁴ Cf. Terence, *Eunuchus*, l. 897:

Tibi illam reddat aut tu eam tangas omnium?

¹⁵ Cf. Terence, *Eunuchus*, l. 749:

Hanc tibi do dond, etc.

¹⁶ Cf. C, l. 2321:

Dunc *la me* ceint li gentilz reis, li magnes.

¹⁷ For exception to the rule that the direct should precede the indirect object compare C, l. 456.

Sire, dist, Gueues, *me l' cuvient à souffrir.*

¹⁸ Cf. Blanc, *Italienische Grammatik*, Halle, 1844, p. 252.

¹⁹ Cf. Adolf Keller, *Altspanisches Lesebuch*, Leipzig, 1890, p. 144.

²⁰ In Old Italian the direct object was also occasionally put before the indirect. Compare Boccaccio, *Decamerone*, 5, 4: *Io il ti prometto*; 6, 4: *se tu non la mi dai*; 7, 9: *ella il mi comandera.*

²¹ Cf. T, 22, 25: *Je le vous* conterai; 24, 47: Sire, *Je le vous* dirai.

²² Cf. *Poema del Cid*, in Keller, l. 259.

yo assi vos lo mando.

²³ Cf. Giovanni Fiorentino, *Il Pecorone*, Milano, 1804, Vol. I, p. 9: *io te lo dirò*; Vol. I, p. 15: *io ve lo dirò.*

the direct object before the indirect, and that the arrangement of the pronouns under consideration was not based on *personal priority* (a desire that certain persons should precede others), is the fact that when two third personal forms are brought together the direct object still comes first.²⁴ In these cases both forms are of the same person, and one cannot see why *le lui* should be used instead of *lui le*, unless it be for the purpose of placing the direct object first.

V.

WHY THE OLD-FRENCH CONSTRUCTIONS *il le me^s dira*; *il le te dira* BECAME *il me le dira* AND *il le te dira*, WHILE *il le lui dira*; *dis-le moi*; *dis-le lui* REMAINED IN MODERN FRENCH.

With reference to the history of the combinations above indicated, Darmesteter and Hatzfeld remark:²⁵

"Pourquoi de ces deux tournures *il le lui dira* et *il le me dira* (ou *il le te dira*), la première s'est-elle maintenue jusqu'à ce jour, tandis que les deux autres ont été modifiées par l'usage? Pourquoi l'impératif les a-t-il toutes gardées: *dis-le moi*; *dis-le lui*?"

1. Taking up in the order given the questions of the grammarians just quoted, it may be said in reply to the first that the Old-French expressions *il me le dira* and *il le te dira* became *il le me dira* and *il le te dira* in Modern French through a desire to place the pronouns of the first and second person before the third. That *il le me dira* could not have become *il me le dira* because the French preferred the indirect object before the direct, is shown by the fact that *il le lui dira* did not become *il lui le dira*.²⁶ Then, since in all cases where two oblique pronouns of different persons are placed immediately before the verb the first and second personal forms always precede those of the third, one is justified in supposing

²⁴ Cf. *il le lui dira*; *il le leur dira*; *il la lui dira*; *il la leur dira*; *il les lui dira*; *il les leur dira*.

²⁵ Cf. Note 12.

²⁶ Cf. § 331.

²⁷ Compare also: *il la lui donnera*; *il les lui donnera*; *il le leur donnera*; *il la leur donnera*; *il les leur donnera*.

that *personal priority*²⁸ is the basis on which these pronouns are arranged in Modern French.

2. Old-French *il le lui dira* equals Modern-French *il le lui dira*.

In answer to the second question included in the quotation already cited from Darmesteter and Hatzfeld,²⁹ it may be stated that *il le lui dira* did not become *il lui le dira* because *le* and *lui* are both of the third person, and hence the personal order would not have been changed by putting *lui* before *le*. Constructions with two third personal forms as just indicated offer no exception to the Modern-French law of *personal priority* already mentioned, since the order of the persons is the same in the combination *le lui* as it would have been in *lui le*.

3. Old-French *dis le mei (moi)*; *dis le lui* equal Modern-French *dis-le-moi*; *dis-le-lui*.

As a rule, the pronouns in question followed the imperative in Old-French³⁰ just as in Modern-French.³¹ After adverbs and conjunctions, however, these pronouns often preceded the imperative.³² Directly traceable to the Old-French construction in which the pronouns stood before the verb in imperative phrases introduced by adverbs is the Modern-French usage of placing the pronouns before a negative imperative.³³ In like manner, the use of the pronoun before the second verb in cases where an imperative affirmative is followed by another, connected with it by *et*³⁴ or *ou*³⁵ is a survival of the Old-French construction where the pronouns were placed before the imperative in phrases introduced by conjunctions.

With the imperative just as in the case of

²⁸ Cf. *il me le donne*; *il le te donne*; *il me la donne*; *il te la donne*; *il me les donne*; *il te les donne*; *il nous la donne*; *il vous le donne*; *il nous la donne*; *il vous la donne*; *il nous les donne*; *il vous les donne*.

²⁹ Cf. above.

³⁰ Cf. V, lxxiv, 22: *Donnez la moy*.

³¹ Cf. Whitney, p. 105: *Vendons-le-leur*.

³² Cf. A. Haase, p. 436: "En ancien français le pronom précédait l'impératif dans les propositions amenées par un adverbe ou une conjonction."

³³ Cf. *Ne me le donnez pas*. Here the pronouns *me le* stand before the imperative because the phrase is introduced by the adverb *ne*.

³⁴ Cf. *Console-toi et m'écoute* (or *écoute-moi*).

³⁵ Cf. *Montrez-les-moi ou me les peignez*.

constructions with two oblique personal pronouns immediately before³⁶ the verb, Old-French usually placed the direct object before the indirect.³⁷ In reply to the question of Darmesteter and Hatzfeld as to why *dis-le-moi* and *dis-le-lui* did not become *dis-me-le* and *dis-lui-le* just as *il le me donne* became *il me le donne* I have the following suggestions to make.

It will be observed that of the twelve constructions³⁸ in which the combinations under consideration may occur with imperatives, six³⁹ of them are constructions in which both pronouns are of the third person, and hence just as in the case of the same phrases before the verb there was no necessity of changing the position of the pronouns for the reason that the personal order is the same in *dis-le-lui* as it would have been in *dis-lui-le*. Then, the six combinations⁴⁰ in which both pronouns are of the third person may have caused the direct object to be kept before the indirect in the six combinations where the two pronouns are of different persons. In the second place, the second pronoun in combinations like *dis-le-lui* is tonic⁴¹ according to the general law in French that the last fully pronounced syllable of a word or stress-group bears the accent. Proving conclusively that the second form in the combinations just mentioned is really accented are constructions like *donnez-m'en* and *rends-t'y* in which *moi* and *toi* when placed before *en* and *y* become *me* and *te*.

A further proof of the statement that the last form in expressions like *dis-le-moi* and *dis-le-lui* is tonic is that the pronouns in such combinations are not attached to the verb for the

reason that no word can bear more than one tonic accent. If the second pronoun in these cases were not accented, both forms would be joined to the verb in French just as they are in Spanish⁴² and Italian,⁴³ where such pronouns are always unaccented, as is shown by the fact that the imperative⁴⁴ and the pronouns standing immediately after it are written as one word.⁴⁵

Now, if we admit that the last pronoun in *dis-le-moi* and *dis-le-lui* is tonic, it is reasonable to suppose that these constructions did not become *dis-me-le* and *dis-lui-le* because *le*, *la* and *les* are atonic forms and can never stand in tonic position. As an objection to this statement, it may be said that for unaccented *le*, *la*, *les* the corresponding tonic forms *lui*, *elle*, *eux*, *elles* could have been substituted. In reply to this objection, I would state that such a substitution could not have been made for several reasons.

In the first place, *lui*, *elle*, *eux*, *elles* are generally used in referring to persons⁴⁶ rather than things, while *le*, *la*, *les* refer to things as often as to persons. Hence, in order to substitute the former for the latter it would be necessary to change the syntactical sphere of tonic pronouns of the third person.

In the second place, if *lui*, *elle*, *eux*, *elles* were substituted for *le*, *la*, *les* in imperative phrases like *dites-le-moi*, this would be the only construction in French in which these disjunctive forms would be used as the simple direct object of a verb.⁴⁷

In the third place, if *lui* were used in conjunctive position as direct object it would be

³⁶ Cf. *il le vous dira*.

³⁷ Cf. C. I. 498: *Livrez le moi, j'en ferai la justise*.

³⁸ The six combinations of the first and third persons are: *donnez-le moi*; *donnez-la moi*; *donnez-les moi*; *donnez-le nous*; *donnez-la nous*; *donnez-les nous*. The six combinations of two third personal forms are: *donnez-le lui*; *donnez-la lui*; *donnez-les lui*; *donnez-le leur*; *donnez-la leur*; *donnez-les leur*.

³⁹ Cf. note 38.

⁴⁰ Cf. note 38.

⁴¹ Cf. Jules Le Coultre, p. 45:

"La règle moderne du pronom avec l'impératif est de le placer après le verbe (avec la forme accentuée pour la première et la seconde personne et avec la forme atone pour la troisième), dans les phrases affirmatives; et avant le verbe (toujours avec la forme atone) dans les phrases négatives."

⁴² Cf. E. W. Manning, *Practical Spanish Grammar*, New York, 1891, p. 34: *Si v. tiene cartas para mí mandemelas v. á mi casa*.

⁴³ Cf. C. H. Grandgent, *Italian Grammar*, Boston, 1891, p. 40: *mandatecelo*.

⁴⁴ In Italian and Spanish these pronouns are also attached to the infinitive and present participle. In Italian they are also joined to the past participle when used without an auxiliary.

⁴⁵ Cf. the Spanish *mandemelas* and the Italian *mandatecelo*.

⁴⁶ Cf. Whitney, p. 246, § 83.

⁴⁷ Tonic *lui*, *elle*, *eux*, *elles* are used as the direct object of a verb only for emphasis, or when two or more objects follow the same verb. Compare: *je vous écoute toi et lui et elle*.

confused with the same form used regularly as indirect object.⁴⁸

Now, if it be granted that the second pronoun in *dis-le-moi* is tonic and that *lui, elle, eux, elles* were not substituted for *le, la, les* in such constructions for the reasons already given, it is reasonable to suppose that *donnez-le-nous* did not become *donnez-nous-le* because *le, la, les* are unaccented and cannot stand in accented position.

The desire to place the pronouns of the first and second person before the third personal forms in French may have been caused by the Spanish⁴⁹ and Italian,⁵⁰ where the third person regularly followed the forms of the first and second person.

It will be noted also that the change of *il le me (le te) dira* to *il me le (le te) dira* is in perfect harmony with the law of euphony. The phrase *il me le dira* is easier to pronounce because it avoids the union of two *l*'s. Showing that the French does not like two *l*'s in succession is the fact that the indefinite *on*, which usually takes the article after *et, ou, où, que, si* requires that the article be omitted, if the next word begins with *l*. For instance, one says *si l'on voit* and *si on le voit*, but never *si l'on le voit*,⁵¹ because of the difficulty of pronouncing the two *l*'s together.

A further proof of the fact that French does not like to place together two monosyllables beginning with *l* is the frequent suppression of *le, la, les* before *lui, leur*,⁵² until the beginning of the seventeenth century.⁵³

⁴⁸ If *donnez-le-moi* had become *donnez-me-lui, lui* used as the direct object might have been confused with *lui* in *donnez-le-lui*, where it is the indirect object.

⁴⁹ Cf. *el me lo da*.

⁵⁰ Cf. *me lo dice*.

⁵¹ Cf. Whitney, p. 127:

"Instead of *on* simply, *l'on* (with the article prefixed) is often used after a vowel sound, especially after *et, ou, où, que, si*: thus, *si l'on voit*, 'if one sees'; but not if the next word begins with *l*."

⁵² Cf. Étienne, § 306:

"*Ellipse du pronom le et surtout du neutre le devant un pronom personnel au datif.*—Dans une phrase comme celle-ci: *il tient le papier, mais je n'ai pu le lui enlever*, il est facile de suppléer *le* et, par suite, de le supprimer; le sens n'en souffrira guère. Cette suppression devant *li, lui, lor* est presque constante dans l'ancien français; elle est éminemment populaire et aujourd'hui encore l'on entend quotidiennement les gens peu lettrés dire: *je li ai donné pour je le lui ai donné*. Ainsi: *tient une chartre, mais ne li puis tolir* (Alex. 71c.)"

⁵³ The Spanish avoids pronouncing two *l*'s in succession by substituting *se* for *le* where *le* would stand before *lo, la*, etc.

The date of the change of constructions like *il le me dira* to *il me le dira* is usually placed anywhere from the fifteenth⁵⁴ to the sixteenth century.⁵⁵ By comparing the résumé (col. 2) it will be seen that sporadic examples of this construction are found as early as the eleventh century,⁵⁶ but the placing of *me, te, nous, vous* before *le, la, les* did not become the rule until the beginning of the fifteenth century.

VI.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Throughout this paper reference to the authors is made by the use of the capital letters placed opposite their names.

- A. Vie de Saint Alexis. Ed. by Gaston Paris and Léopold Pannier. Paris, 1887.
- B. Karls des Grossen Reise. Ed. by Eduard Koschwitz. (In) Altfranzösische Bibliothek. Heilbronn, 1883.
- C. Chanson de Roland. Ed. by Léon Gautier (Septième édition). Tours, 1880.
- D. Chrétien de Troies: Yvain. Ed. by W. Foerster. Halle, 1891.
- E. Marie de France: Die Fabeln der Marie de France. Ed. by Karl Warnke. (In) Bibliotheca Normannica, Vol. vi. Halle, 1898.
- F. Aucassin und Nicolette. Ed. by Hermann Suchier. Paderborn, 1889.
- G. Élie de Saint-Gilles. Publ. by Gaston Raynaud. Paris, 1879 (Société des anciens textes français).
- H. La Naissance du Chevalier au Cygne, ou les Enfants Changés en Cygnes. Ed. by Henry Alfred Todd. Baltimore, 1889.
- I. La Mort Aymeri de Narbonne. Pub. by J. Couraye du Parc. Paris, 1884 (Société des anciens textes français).

Compare Manning, § 90: Of two conjunctive pronouns (neither being reflexive) of the third person, the indirect takes the form *se* where otherwise such combinations as *le, la*, etc., would occur: as, *quiero darselo*.

The Italian avoids the union of two *l*'s in such combinations by giving the first *l* a mouillée sound (cf. *glielo* for *li lo*).

⁵⁴ Cf. Haase, § 154.

⁵⁵ Cf. Darmesteter and Hatzfeld, § 331.

⁵⁶ Cf. C. I. 456: "Sire", dist Gueues, "*me l'* cuvient à souffrir.

- J. Altfranzösische Romanzen und Pastourel-
len. Ed. by Karl Bartsch. Leipzig, 1870.
- K. Guillaume de Lorris: Roman de la Rose.
Ed. by Francisque Michel, ll. 1-4669.
Paris, 1864.
- L. Fragments d'une Vie de Saint Thomas
de Cantorbéry. Pub. by Paul Meyer.
Paris, 1885 (Société des anciens textes
français).
- M. Jean de Meun: Roman de la Rose. Ed.
by Francisque Michel, ll. 4670-22817.
Paris, 1864.
- N. La Clef d'Amors. Ed. by A. Doutrepont.
(In) Bibliotheca Normannica, Vol. v.
Halle, 1890.
- O. Nicole Margival: Le Dit de la Panthère
d'Amours. Pub. by Henry Alfred Todd.
Paris, 1883 (Société des anciens textes
français).
- P. Robert de Blois: Floris et Liriope. Pub.
by Dr. Wolfram V. Zingerle. Leipzig,
1891.
- Q. Brun de la Montaigne. Pub. by Paul
Meyer. Paris, 1875 (Société des anciens
textes français).
- R. Cronique du Mont-Saint-Michel. Pub. by
Simeon Luce. Vol. i. Paris, 1879 (So-
ciété des anciens textes français).
- S. Seigneur d'Anglure; Le Saint Voyage de
Jherusalem. Paris, 1878 (Société des
anciens textes français).
- T. Le Débat des Herauts d'Armes de France
et d'Angleterre. Pub. by Léopold Pan-
nier et Paul Meyer. Paris, 1875 (Société
des anciens textes français).
- U. François Villon: Œuvres de François
Villon. Ed. by Auguste Longnon. Paris,
1892.
- V. Rondeaux et Autres Poésies du xv^e Siècle.
Pub. by Gaston Raynaud. Paris, 1889
(Société des anciens textes français).
- W. Chansons du xv^e Siècle. Pub. by Gaston
Paris, 1875 (Société des anciens textes
français).
- X. Martial d'Auvergne: L'Amant Rendu
Cordelier à l'Observance d'Amours. Pub.
by A. De Montaiglon. Paris, 1881 (So-
ciété des anciens textes français).
- Y. Clement Marot: Œuvres Complètes. Vol.
i. Paris, 1824.
- Z. Montaigne: Essais. Ed. by Charles
Louandre. Vol. i. Paris, 1876.
- AA. François Malherbe: Poésies. Paris, 1842.
- BB. Molière: Œuvres. (In) Les Grands
Écrivains de la France, Vol. v. Paris,
1880.
- CC. Racine: Œuvres. Ed. by Paul Mesnard,
Vol. iii. Paris, 1885.
- DD. George Sand: La Mare au Diable. Ed.
by F. C. de Sumichrast. Boston, 1896.
OLIVER M. JOHNSTON.
Leland Stanford Jr. University.

THE BÖSE GEIST IN THE CATHE- DRAL SCENE, FAUST I.

The Cathedral Scene in Goethe's *Faust* has been the occasion of much speculation on the part of commentators, not only with respect to its position in the drama, but also with respect to the identity of the "Evil Spirit" there represented as speaking to Gretchen. Some critics have discussed at length the difficulties of the first question, assigning now this, now that place to the scene, and have passed over the second question without attempting to identify the spirit, while others have given various explanations of it, such as simply 'evil spirit,' 'Gretchen's own guilty conscience,' 'a horrible fiend,' 'the Devil,' and even 'Mephistopheles' himself. How an *evil* spirit could express the thoughts there ascribed to that character is a matter that has puzzled many. For the purpose of reviewing the different interpretations of the spirit, I shall quote the opinions of a few of the commentators, and thus lead up to the most recent of the writers who claim that the *Böse Geist* represents Mephistopheles. As the first editions of the commentaries are not in all cases accessible, I cannot conveniently arrange the extracts in chronological order. There will, however, be no misapprehension, if I give in each case the date, with the number, of the edition from which I make quotations.

The majority of *Faust* scholars, beginning with the veteran Düntzer, have seen in the *Böse Geist* merely the personification of Gretchen's guilty conscience. Düntzer declared:

¹ *Goethes Faust*, Erster und zweiter Teil. Zum erstenmal vollständig erläutert. Zweite Auflage. Leipzig, 1859, p. 339.

Das böse Gewissen tritt hier als böser Geist auf. . .

and three pages farther on occur the words :

. . . die Einflüsterungen desselben (sc. des bösen Geistes), die nichts anderes sind, als ihre eigene Gewissensangst. . .

Similarly Carrière :²

"Orgelklang und Gesang eines Traueramts, wol für die Ihrigen selbst, werden ihr zur anklagenden, richtenden Geisterstimme des bösen Gewissens."

Schröer³ agrees substantially with this view :

"Was der böse Geist spricht, vergegenwärtigt uns die Gedanken und Gefühle, die bei den Tönen der Orgel in Gretchen auftauchen und sie beängstigen."

And he remarks again⁴ in connection with the second speech of the *Geist* :

"Es ist meisterhaft das Innere der Unglücklichen dargestellt, indem die Worte des bösen Geistes die Uebersetzung einzelner Sätze der lateinischen Hymne geben ; wir erkennen daraus : Gretchen errät den furchtbaren Inhalt des Gesanges."

Couplands expresses himself as follows :

"What wonder, then, that at the high service of the Cathedral Mass for the souls of the departed, Margaret's thoughts shape themselves into terrible images, and that behind her chair seems stationed a horrible fiend, who pierces the very core of her heart, supplying torment fit for the souls of the damned."

And again he says⁵

"The tormenting fiend in her own breast emphasizes the doom."

Professor Thomas⁷ is equally conservative :

"The Böser Geist is a personification of Gretchen's tormenting conscience."

Lewes⁸ refers thus to the cathedral scene :

"Der schmerzlichste Augenblick ihres Lebens rückt heran, sie schleppt sich in den Dom, aber

findet hier keinen Trost, die furchtbarsten Qualen brechen über sie herein."

Weitbrecht⁹ remarks :

"War es im Zwinger nur die Not des geängstigten Herzens, so spricht im Dom auch das erwachte Schuldbewusstsein."

Sabatier¹⁰ translates *Böser Geist* by "l'esprit mauvais," using the definite article, while Bayard Taylor¹¹ and Miss Swanwick¹² render it simply by "evil spirit."

Von Loeper¹³ wrote in the introduction to his edition :

"Der 'böse Geist' ist dieses nur uneigentlich, insofern er die Gewissens-Unruhe, die Stimme von Gretchens eignem schlechten Gewissen darstellt, also eigentlich ein guter Geist. Eine entgegenstehende Auffassung, wonach der 'böse Geist' Gretchens Verblendung sein soll, welche sie von einem blossen Fehl zu einer wirklichen Missethat, der spätern Tödtung ihres Kindes, hintreibe,—was an sich richtig ist,—beruht doch auf zu künstlicher Auslegung. (Marggraff in den *Bl. f. lit. Unterh.* 1859, Nr. 49, u. 1860, Nr. 12)."

But in the introduction to the second *Bearbeitung*¹⁴ we find that von Loeper has changed his mind and now writes :

"Der 'böse Geist' ist nicht nur die Gewissens-unruhe, die Stimme von Gretchens eignem schlechten Gewissen, dann wäre es ein guter Geist, sondern der Teufel, der jenes schlechte Gewissen von dem Fehl zu dem Verbrechen treibt, von welchem wir im Stücke bald erfahren."

And he adds in a foot-note:

"Meine frühere entgegengesetzte Auffassung habe ich als nicht haltbar erkannt ; ich folge Marggraff (*Bl. f. lit. Unterh.*, 1859, Nr. 49, u. 1860, Nr. 12), Köstlin, S. 64, u. A. m., während z. B. Dingelstedt unter dem bösen Geist nur Gretchens erwachtes Gewissen, die Stimme ihres ahnungsvollen Innern versteht."

Under the text of the cathedral scene, on p. 163, he has this further note :

⁹ *Diesseits von Weimar*. Stuttgart, 1895, p. 304.

¹⁰ Sabatier, *Le Faust de Goethe traduit en français*. Paris, 1893, p. 150.

¹¹ In his *Translation of Faust*. Boston, (1870) 1889, p. 175.

¹² In her *Translation of Faust*. London, 1892, p. 134.

¹³ *Goethe's Faust. Eine Tragödie*. Nach den vorzüglichsten Quellen revidierte Ausgabe. Berlin, (1870), pp. lix-lx.

¹⁴ *Faust. Eine Tragödie von Goethe*. Mit Einleitung und erklärenden Anmerkungen. Zweite Bearbeitung, Berlin, 1879, p. lxi.

² *Faust. Eine Tragödie von Johann Wolfgang von Goethe*. Mit Einleitung und Erläuterungen. Leipzig, 1869, p. 213.

³ *Faust von Goethe*. Mit Einleitung und fortlaufender Erklärung. Dritte Auflage. Leipzig, 1892, p. 249.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 250 f.

⁵ *The Spirit of Goethe's Faust*. London, 1885, p. 152.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 153. The Italics are mine.

⁷ *Goethe's Faust*. Boston, 1892, p. 325.

⁸ *Goethes Frauengestalten*. Stuttgart, 1894, p. 391.

"Diesen bösen Geist schildert ein Zeitgenosse des historischen Faust: Non est ille divinus et salutaris timor: nec a Deo proveniens, sed furor et nocentis conscientiae vermis: qui rodit quotidie atque urit malam mentem (Reuchlin II, p. 5)."

It appears, then, that von Loeper is now of the opinion that the *Geist* is not "merely the unrest," that is, not the mere unrest of Gretchen's conscience, but something quite different, namely, the Devil, who makes use of that conscience for his own ends; and he attempts to defend his position by saying that if the spirit were identical with Gretchen's conscience it would be a good spirit; so in order to account for the bad element, he infers that it must be the Devil. It is not quite clear whether he means by "der Teufel" the Devil or Mephistopheles. I consider his argument unsound. May not *böser* be interpreted by calling the conscience 'evil, cruel, tormenting', because it brings home to Gretchen more vividly her guilt? Such an explanation is certainly borne out by the words *Gedanken . . . wider mich* (in lines 3795 and 3797), that is, 'attacking me, besetting me, tormenting me'. I shall refer to this passage again. These very words show wherein von Loeper makes a mistake: the spirit is *böse* subjectively, that is, from Gretchen's point of view, with which the poet himself and the great majority, if not all, of his readers are in sympathy; and von Loeper is further mistaken in assuming that a good spirit, an emissary of the Deity, would find nothing better to do than to drive a poor sinner who is already penitent, to desperation and thereby to still more grievous sin. But while the use of the adjective *böse* is sufficiently justified by the considerations presented above, we need not assume that it was first suggested by them. It was simply demanded by the German locution *das böse Gewissen* (very rarely *das schlechte* or *schuldige Gewissen*); in personifying *das böse Gewissen* as a spirit, the spirit

¹⁵ On this point cf. Woldemar Freiherr von Biedermann's chapter on the *Domszene* in his *Goethe-Forschungen III, Anderweite Folge*, Leipzig, 1899, more particularly p. 36. This chapter is an article reprinted from the *Wissensch. Beilage der Leipziger Zeitung*, 1893, No. 33, and was originally suggested by a contribution by Paul Harms in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, 1892, No. 231, in which the author came to the radical conclusion that the whole Cathedral Scene might be dispensed with on the stage.

became of necessity *ein böser Geist*. Düntzer must have been conscious of that parallelism¹⁵ when he wrote the words quoted above:

"Das böse Gewissen tritt hier als böser Geist auf."

Boyesen¹⁶ seems inclined to confusion with regard to the identity of the spirit; his words are:

"Whether the evil spirit, who stands behind her, mingling his relentless voice with that of the anthem, be Mephistopheles or some minor emissary of Satan is of little consequence. It is the voice of her own conscience which sounds audibly in her ears, filling her with dread, bewildering her thoughts, and distracting her poor, half-crazed brain."

Biedermann¹⁷ points out that, if the *Geist* is intended to mean Gretchen's conscience, the difficulty of representation can not be overlooked, and this difficulty is shown by the manifold ways in which the representation has been attempted. Since neither popular belief nor art has given a visible form to Conscience, there is altogether lacking any means of making the spectators readily understand the nature and character of the *Geist* on the stage. He says further:¹⁸

"Kurz, es ist geradezu undenkbar (*sic!*), wie Goethe auf den Gedanken gekommen sein sollte, Gretchen's Gewissen durch den Bösen Geist darzustellen. Ganz anders liegt jedoch die Sache, wenn Goethe etwas Derartiges vorfand, wenn er den bösen Geist als Erreger des Gewissens einer Quelle entnahm, die sich sonst für seinen 'Faust' ergiebig erwies. Und da brauchen wir denn nicht lange zu suchen: diese Quelle ist die Bibel. Nachdem im 1. Buch Samuel's berichtet ist, dass König Saul sich an Gott versündigt habe (15, 20-26; 16, 1), heisst es im 16. Capitel, Vers 14: 'Ein Böser Geist vom Herrn machte ihn sehr unruhig.' Hier auf Vers 15: 'Da sprachen die Knechte Saul's zu ihm: Siehe ein Böser Geist von Gott machet dich sehr unruhig.'"

We now come to a recent writer, Professor Friedrich Paulsen, of Berlin, who, in an article on Mephistopheles in the August number (1899) of the *Deutsche Rundschau*, simply takes it for granted that the *Geist* is Mephistopheles.

¹⁶ Goethe and Schiller, *their Lives and Works, including a Commentary on Goethe's Faust*. New York (1879), 7th ed., 1894, p. 223.

¹⁷ *Goethe-Forschungen III*, Leipzig, 1899, p. 35.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

After speaking of Gretchen's effort to cast off sin and purify herself, he continues:¹⁹

"Und Mephistopheles selbst hilft ihr dazu. Er ist, so schlau er ist, zugleich doch der dumme Teufel; *als böser Geist, in der Scene im Dom*, steigert er durch seine Einflüsterungen ihre Gewissensangst, statt vielmehr ihr beruhigend zuzureden, es sei nicht schlimm, das wäre schon Anderen so gegangen, sie habe ja nichts Schlimmes gethan, Alles, was sie dazu getrieben, sei ja so gut und lieb gewesen. So hätte es ihm gelingen mögen, sie zu beschwichtigen, ihr Gewissen abzustumpfen, und sie allmählich auf den Weg zu bringen, den ihr sterbender Bruder sie schon wandeln sieht, den Weg zu wirklicher Gemeinheit. Die Ursache seines Fehlschlagens liegt aber in seinem eigensten Wesen, es ist die Lust, sich an dem Schaden zu letzen, sich an dem Verderben seines Opfers zu weiden; er kann sich nicht bezwingen, *er muss bei ihrem Jammer dabei stehen und ihr mit höhnischem Grinsen vorhalten, was sie gethan hat*. Aber eben damit treibt er sie nur tiefer in die Busse hinein und verliert damit die Seele, über die er freilich nie etwas vermocht hat, wie er es vorahnend nach der ersten Begegnung ausspricht."

It is just possible that Professor Paulsen has been unconsciously led to the belief that the *Geist* is Mephistopheles by that earlier passage (lines 2621-2626) in which Mephistopheles states that he had been present when Gretchen was at confession; the last sentence in the quotation above shows, at any rate, that Paulsen had that passage in mind, and from it he may have inferred that it would be an easy matter for Mephistopheles to be near Gretchen during mass in the Cathedral Scene.

But there is no evidence at all in the Cathedral Scene itself to justify us in supposing that Goethe intended the *Geist* for Mephistopheles. In the first place, the thoughts expressed by the *Geist* are not such as would be expected of a devil. They are, perhaps, Mephistophelian in their tormenting character, but on the whole there is too much tender feeling in them to suggest Mephistopheles; witness, for example, the first seven lines of the scene, 3776-3782:

"Wie anders, Gretchen, war dir's,
Als du noch voll Unschuld
Hier zum Altar trat'st,
Aus dem vergriffnen Büchelchen
Gebete lalltest,
Halb Kinderspiele,
Halb Gott im Herzen!"

¹⁹ Pp. 206-207. The Italics are mine.

When, too, did Mephistopheles ever speak of the glorified and the pure, except in terms of doubt, contempt, scorn, or cynicism? But read lines 3828-3831:

"Ihr Anlitz wenden
Verklärte von dir ab,
Die Hände dir zu reichen,
Schauert's den Reinen,
Weh!"

Furthermore, Goethe invariably, in both parts of the poem, calls Mephistopheles by his name; Professor Paulsen fails to explain why he thinks that the poet in this particular scene departed from that practice by using the designation *Böser Geist*. All these facts tend to show that the *Geist* does not stand for Mephistopheles. That it does represent Gretchen's guilty conscience follows conclusively, if further evidence is necessary, from lines 3794-3797:²⁰

"Weh! Weh!
Wär' ich der Gedanken los,
Die mir herüber und hinüber gehen
Wider mich!"

Nothing could be plainer than these words. It is not to be supposed for a moment that Goethe meant a devil incarnate, with a human voice, to be mistaken by Gretchen for her own thoughts; that is inconceivable. Even the stage-direction²¹ at the opening of the scene, "*Böser Geist hinter Gretchen*," in no way proves the presence of a devil incarnate. Gretchen's thoughts could not be presented in any other way than by a personification—except indeed in a monologue, which would have been not only a clumsy contrivance and undramatic, but quite out of place in church during high mass. Besides, the personification²² of this inner spirit voice is precisely what we should expect of Goethe's *gegenständlicher Denkweise*; Biedermann's remarkable assertion to the contrary, in the passage quoted above, is simply incomprehensible. Gretchen does not even imagine the presence of a *spirit*; she realizes only her *Gedanken*,²³ and the *spirit*

²⁰ The significance of this passage was pointed out to me by Professor Schilling, and I am glad to acknowledge my indebtedness to him.

²¹ Cf. Biedermann, *l. c.*, p. 34.

²² Cf. Scherer in *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, Vol. vi, 1885, p. 241.

²³ Scherer, *l. c.*, p. 240.

is a poetical device of Goethe's to present her thoughts.

The internal evidence furnished by the scene itself compels us to adhere to the view that the *böse Geist* is simply 'a personification of Gretchen's tormenting conscience.'

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON.

University of Iowa.

THE SOURCES OF L'AVARE.

ALTHOUGH we cannot state with certainty the particular cause or causes that induced Molière to choose the subject of avarice, there are a number of circumstances by which, it seems, his attention was naturally directed towards such a theme. The first of these is that avarice was much discussed in those times, as we may infer from a number of passages found in writers like La Bruyère, Boileau, Tallemant des Réaux, La Fontaine and others.

Some of these contain merely general moral reflections on the vice in question, others however describe real occurrences with which Molière was undoubtedly acquainted. Moreover, if we are to judge of the character of the elder Poquelin in the light of recent research, it is more than likely that our poet reproduced a number of his father's traits in the character of Harpagon.

Among the stories current then we may mention that of a certain Charles Maslon, seigneur de Bersy, and his son. The former was a miser and practised usury, and the latter borrowed money at a high rate of interest—each without the knowledge of the other. One day the two met under circumstances very much the same as Harpagon and Cléante in *L'Avare* ii, 2. The father exclaimed: "Ah! débauché, c'est toi?" to which the son replied: "Ah! vieil usurier, c'est vous?"¹

Perhaps the most notorious misers known at that time were the lieutenant-criminal Tardieu and his wife. Tallemant des Réaux² speaks of them as follows:

¹ Boisrobert's *Belle Plaidouse* is said to be based on this occurrence.

² Cf. Tallemant des Réaux, *Les Historiettes* (ed. Monmerqué et Paris), t. iii, p. 137.

"Ils n'ont pour tous valets qu'un cocher: le carrosse est si méchant et les chevaux aussi, qu'ils ne peuvent aller."

Molière, it seems, made use of these and other real or fictitious events—but whether they, or his reading of plays in which avarice formed the subject, gave him his first inspiration cannot be determined.

In the following will be found the principal sources of Molière's comedy. On account of its striking resemblance to *L'Avare* we shall begin with an analysis of the *Aulularia* by Plautus.

Aulularia.

Euclio, a poor man, has accidentally discovered a pot of gold which his grandfather had hidden in the house before his death. He is now anxiously watching lest any one should find out where he has concealed the treasure. His suspicion is aroused by the fact that everybody salutes him more civilly than before, and when Megadorus, a rich gentleman, asks his daughter in marriage, he thinks that he is aiming at his gold. When, however, the suitor for Phædra's hand shows his willingness to marry her without a dowry, Euclio gives his consent. While the preparations for the wedding are going on, Euclio goes to the market in order to buy a wedding-present for his daughter. On his return he finds in his house a number of cooks whom Megadorus has sent in order to prepare the marriage feast. He scolds, beats and drives them out because he suspects that they are after his money. He then conceals his pot in the Temple of Faith. Strobilus, a slave of Lyconides, overhears Euclio's conversation concerning the hiding-place of the gold, and he resolves to steal it. The miser, however, discovers the would-be thief just in time to prevent him from carrying out his project. He then takes his pot to an unfrequented grove. The slave overhears him again, and he now succeeds in stealing the gold after watching Euclio from a tree as the latter is burying his treasure. As soon as Euclio discovers the loss of his money, he laments most bitterly. Lyconides, a nephew of Mega-

³ Cf. *Zeitschrift für neufranz. Sprache u. Litteratur*, vol. viii, p. 51 ff. Also *Molière*, in the *Grands écrivains*, series, t. vii, p. 14 ff.

dorus and also in love with Phædra, to whom he has done violence, thinking that the miser is lamenting over his daughter, confesses to him his crime. This gives rise to a comical misunderstanding since Euclio is under the impression that Lyconides is confessing the theft of the pot. Lyconides asks for Phædra's hand, and announces at the same time to the miser that Megadorus has given up his claim to her hand in his favor. When Strobilus informs his master that he has stolen Euclio's treasure, Lyconides orders him to give it up at once, so that he may restore it to its rightful owner. The slave is willing to do so on condition that Lyconides will set him free. Here ends Plautus' comedy. There exists a supplement written by Codrus Urceus, an Italian grammarian, according to which Lyconides becomes the son-in-law of Euclio and his heir—for the miser has suddenly become so liberal as to give him all his gold in addition to his daughter.

In general outline the *Aulularia* and *L'Avare* resemble each other very closely—in each there is a miser (Euclio and Harpagon), a daughter (Phædra and Élise), and her two lovers (Megadorus and Lyconides—Anselme and Valère). The part of Strobilus becomes that of La Flèche in Molière's comedy. Again, in both plays we find a number of servants who are made to suffer from harsh treatment, and who freely give vent to their feelings. Molière produced some fine comic effects by means of these servants. But although the principal characters of the *Aulularia* reappear in *L'Avare*, their particular treatment differs greatly in the two comedies.

The characters newly created by Molière are Cléante, Mariane, Frosine, Maître Simon, and the Commissaire.

The most general difference between the two misers is that one has been a poor man until he suddenly finds a pot of gold; whereas the other, Harpagon, has always kept up a comparatively big establishment comprising a large house and garden, a carriage, horses and a number of servants. Euclio continues the same mode of living as before he found the treasure, and there is nothing in his surroundings to show that he is in good circumstances.

⁴ Staphyla also reappears to some extent in Cléante's valet.

Harpagon, on the other hand, exhibits his avarice in the midst of comparative elegance.

This difference becomes all the more interesting, since Harpagon's downright niggardliness and sordid avarice form a marked contrast to the 'milieu' in which he moves. The result is that he becomes extremely odious, and, at the same time, comic. There are other differences between the two misers, the principal one being that Harpagon is in love, while Euclio is not. To make a miser—and an old miser at that—fall in love, adds much to the comic effect not only of this character but also of the entire comedy. Moreover, Harpagon is in love with the same girl as his son. From this difference in the general plan of the two plays arises the necessity of creating most of the additional personages found in *L'Avare*.

If we now consider the purpose of the Latin comedy, we shall find that it is not so much to depict the avarice of Euclio as it is to describe the fate of a pot of gold. Hence the comedy becomes one of situations, whereas *L'Avare* is a comedy of character. Euclio's chief concern is to find a hiding-place for his pot. The effects of his avarice can hardly be said to manifest themselves anywhere very strongly. No one suffers seriously in consequence of it. In *L'Avare*, however, Molière's principal purpose was to show the evil effects of the miser's stinginess upon his children, his sweetheart, his servants, Anselme, Frosine and even his horses—in short on every one that comes in contact with him. In *L'Avare* all the characters are made to set forth the principal one, thus differing again from the *Aulularia*, in which the characters have a more independent existence. Finally Plautus had in mind an ulterior aim which was partly religious and partly political. The Lares neglected by Euclio have taken vengeance upon him by keeping him poor for a long time. As for the political purpose, Plautus aimed at bringing the rich and poor into closer union by intermarriage between those classes. He holds up before his audience the example of Megadorus.

Of the characters retained in *L'Avare* from the *Aulularia* it is to be said that what Megadorus has lost in Anselme, Lyconides has gained in Valère. Megadorus seems a man

of flesh and blood compared with Anselme. Closely connected with this fact is the unnatural dénouement of *L'Avare*. As for Lyconides he seems a weakling by the side of Valère, the former acts like a coward who has no will of his own, but is driven about by the force of circumstances; Valère, on the other hand, will risk everything in order to win the hand of Élise his beloved. It is to the credit of the French author to have purified the relations between the young people. A general comparison between the two comedies shows that *L'Avare* is a much more artistic and living production than the *Aulularia*. While the broad outlines of both are the same, the particular age and society in which they were written make them differ widely. But more than this, the superior talent of Molière changed and amplified the comedy of Plautus in so skilful a manner that the *Aulularia* seems a mere sketch when compared with *L'Avare*. There is a charm and finish in the work of Molière that reveals at once the greater genius and a period of higher social refinement.

LARIVEY'S *Les Esprits*.

Among the French sources of *L'Avare* mention is usually made first of *Les Esprits*, a comedy by Larivey (1579). This comedy is founded on several plays, among them the *Aulularia*. Séverin, an inveterate miser, has a son and a daughter, Urbain and Laurence, who live with him; Fortuné, another son has been adopted by the miser's brother Hilaire. Urbain is secretly in love with Féliciane, and Laurence loves a young man named Désiré. The miser, who is opposed to the plans of his children, is greatly troubled by a treasure that he carries about with him in a purse. Fearing lest some one may get possession of his money, the miser buries his purse. Désiré watches him, steals the purse and puts it back after having filled it with pebbles. The lover of Laurence, through the intercession of Séverin's brother, Hilaire, restores the money to the miser on condition that he will consent to the marriages of his children Urbain and Laurence.

From a close comparison between *Les Esprits* and *L'Avare* it appears that Molière made considerable use of the former comedy. Séverin makes himself ridiculous by his avarice

and brings upon himself the hatred of his children through his hardheartedness. These traits reappear, but more strongly in *L'Avare*. The special obligation of Molière to Larivey is the recognition scene towards the end of *L'Avare* (v, 5). In *Les Esprits* the father of Féliciane, a rich merchant, reappears after a long absence, and by this timely return the marriage of his daughter is greatly facilitated. Molière is also indebted to Larivey for the relation in which Cléante and Mariane stand to each other (compare that of Urbain and Féliciane in *Les Esprits*). In Molière's comedy, however, this relation has become purified. Finally, in the order of arrangement of scenes, Molière follows *Les Esprits* more closely than the *Aulularia*.

La Belle Plaideuse.

Another comedy, *La Belle Plaideuse*, by Boisrobert (1654) furnished Molière with a suggestion for the scene between Harpagon and Cléante, where the latter discovers that his father is a usurer (ii, 2) (cf. *La Belle Plaideuse*, i, 8). In the same play our author found a sketch of the memorandum-scene which he so admirably developed in *L'Avare* (ii, 1). All that interests us here in *La Belle Plaideuse* may be summed up as follows: Ergaste, the miser's son, is in love with Corinne, who is in need of money in order to carry on a lawsuit for the purpose of recovering an inheritance. The lover tries to borrow the money for her and succeeds in finding what he wants, but he will have to pay a high rate of interest. When, finally, lender and borrower meet, they prove to be father and son. This unfortunate outcome of Ergaste's plan induces him to try other means. He finds a second usurer who is ready to favor him with the loan, provided he will pay eight and one-third per cent interest and is willing, moreover, to accept a lot of old rubbish for the larger part of the money.

The valet reports from the usurer:

Il veut bien vous fournir les quinze mille francs;

 Encor qu'au denier douze il prête cette somme
 Sur bonne caution, il n'a que mille écus (3000 francs)
 Qu'il donne argent comptant.

La Belle Plaideuse ends with the news that Corinne has won her lawsuit, and this induces

the miser Amidor to give his consent to the double marriage. There are other resemblances between *La Belle Plaideuse* and *L'Avare*, all of which point to the fact that Molière made ample use of the former play. Thus, for instance, we find in *La Belle Plaideuse* a double love-intrigue; that is, in addition to the one mentioned, there is that between Ergaste's sister and Corinne's brother. It is this second love-affair that seems to have suggested to Molière many points for the relation existing between Élise and Valère.

As for the misers in *La Belle Plaideuse* and *L'Avare*, we find that in both plays they are wealthy, and occupy a certain social position, which is not so with Euclio in the *Aulularia*. Finally, attention may be called to the fact that Filipin, the valet, and La Flèche resemble each other in a number of essential traits.

La Mère Coquette.

Molière is also indebted to Quinault's *La Mère Coquette*, written in 1665. The comedy contains a double rivalry: Ismène, whose husband is supposed to be dead, tries to win the affection of Acante, the lover of Isabelle, her daughter. Acante, on the other hand, has a rival in his father Crémante, an old miser, who, treats his son in a niggardly fashion and is determined to marry the latter's sweetheart. Finally Ismène's former husband returns after a long absence, and the play ends with Acante's happy marriage with Isabelle.

There are other French comedies showing certain close resemblances with *L'Avare*, as *La Veuve* by Larivey, *L'Héritier ridicule* by Scarron, *Les Barbons amoureux* by Chevalier and *La Dame d'intrigue* by Chappuzeau. In reference to these plays, however, it may be said that we do not know to what extent he was indebted to them or, indeed, whether he was indebted to them at all.

I Suppositi.

The principal Italian source used by Molière is the comedy entitled *I Suppositi* by Ariosto (1509). From the following brief analysis the resemblance between this play and *L'Avare* will be readily seen. A wealthy young Sicilian, by the name of Erostrato has come to Ferrara

⁵ Cf. *Opere Minori* di Lodovico Ariosto, tomo ii. Firenze, 1857.

in order to study law. One day while walking on the street he sees a young lady, Polinesta, and falls in love with her. In order to be always near his sweetheart, Erostrato determines to enter the service of her father, Damonio, an old miser, and to accomplish this he assumes the name of his own servant Dulippo. He is aided in his project by Polinesta's nurse.⁶ Now it happens that a wealthy old miser Cleandro seeks the same young lady in marriage and finds a favorable hearing with Damonio. The love between Erostrato and Polinesta is finally discovered, and the lover is thrown into prison. The latter, like Valère in *L'Avare*, has won his master's favor to the detriment of a servant, Nevola, who now greatly rejoices at the idea of being avenged. Erostrato's father, Filogono, arrives from Sicily just in time not only to free his son from imprisonment, but also to bring about his marriage with Polinesta after Cleandro has renounced his claim to her hand. Besides the points of resemblance that appear from this analysis we find in *I Suppositi* (i, 2) a parasite, Pasifilo who flatters Cleandro regarding his looks and age very much as Frosine does Harpagon in *L'Avare* (ii, sc. 5).

The claims⁷ which have been advanced in favor of a number of other Italian comedies as being additional sources from which Molière drew, may be disregarded since in some cases such comedies were based, like *L'Avare*, upon the *Aulularia*; as, for instance, *La Sporta* by Gelli; in others it has been found that the imitation is on the side of the Italians rather than on that of Molière. This is true of plays like *L'Amante tradito*, *Il Dottor bacchettone*, *Le Case svaligiate* and *La Cameriera nobile*, comedies which belonged to the style called 'comedia dell'arte' in which the actors had to improvise to a large extent, and whose dates it has been impossible to ascertain. It is difficult to say whether Molière was acquainted with the works of Lucian and Martial, but if he was the former's dialogue, *The Cock or the Dream*, and the latter's *Epigram* ix, 9 may have suggested to him some ideas for *L'Avare*.

For further possible sources⁸ cf. Körting's

⁶ For a similar situation cf. *L'Avare* i, 1 (end).

⁷ Cf. Riccoboni, *Observations sur la comédie et sur le génie de Molière* (Paris, 1736).

⁸ A few minor details not mentioned here will be found in the notes to the author's forthcoming edition of *L'Avare*.

Geschichte des französischen Romans im xvii. Jahrhundert ii, p. 70; *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France* i, pp. 38-48.

MORITZ LEVI.

University of Michigan.

THE SEMASIOLOGY OF *understand*,
verstehen, ἐπιστάμαι.

IN the December number of the MOD. LANG. NOTES Prof. George Hempl takes exception to my explanation of *understand*, etc. It may be that my language was "more or less obscure," and that consequently Prof. Hempl was unable to "separate out or distinguish" my real meaning. Allow me, therefore, to make a desperate effort to express myself less elusively in order that my meaning may be more easily 'caught.'

My statement in the May number, 1899, was:

"In words expressing separation the meaning 'understand' may develop in two ways: 1. 'separate,' 'distinguish'; 2. 'separate,' 'take away,' 'take in,' 'perceive.' To the first class belong Lat. *cerno*, *distinguo*; to the second *intelligo*, *percipio*."

Prof. Hempl says:

"This classification seems to me not quite satisfactory. I propose instead: 1. 'separate,' 'unterscheiden,' 'distinguish,' or 'gather,' 'intelligo,' 'understand.' 2. 'grasp,' 'begreifen,' 'perceive.' 3. 'take in,' 'devour,' 'swallow (gullibly).'"

My classification was not intended to be complete. In it I confined myself to "words expressing separation," dividing them into two classes. These two classes Prof. Hempl combines in his class 1. 'separate,' 'unterscheiden,' 'distinguish' [my class 1.], or 'gather,' 'intelligo,' 'understand' [my class 2.]. What I mean by 'separate,' 'take away,' 'take in,' Prof. Hempl expresses by 'gather,' 'intelligo.' My choice of words may have been infelicitous. My intention, however, was to call attention to what seems to me a plainly marked distinction between 1. 'separate,' 'distinguish' and 2. 'separate,' 'take away,' 'take to oneself,' 'take into the mind,' 'perceive.'

That, as I take it—notice that 'take' here means 'understand' and belongs to my second class of such words—is what Prof. Hempl implies by his class 1. For though he puts un-

der one head the two ideas 'distinguish' and 'gather' (that is, 'infer,' 'take into the mind'), he separates them by 'or' and must have kept them distinct in his mind. For Prof. Hempl has a keenly logical mind, and no logical mind could do otherwise.

Prof. Hempl's class 2. 'grasp,' 'begreifen,' 'perceive' [why not 'comprehend' rather than 'perceive'?], I did not discuss at all. For such terms do not imply separation but the taking of a subject into the mind in its entirety, and hence the thorough mastery of an idea or a subject. I had said, however, in the first paragraph of my article:

"A term denoting insight, perception, understanding, may primarily mean one of several things, the most common of which are: 'sharpness,' 'keenness,' 'acuteness' [for example, *penetrate*]; 'grasping,' 'comprehension'; 'separating,' 'distinguishing.'"

Prof. Hempl's class 3. 'take in,' 'devour,' 'swallow (gullibly)' was still farther from my mind. For these terms imply neither separation nor understanding. The turn given to 'take in' here is entirely different from its use in my classification.

Several other classes might be added to these, as: 'follow,' implying rapidity of thought or speech in the person heard; 'trace,' implying an indistinct or hidden meaning; 'unravel,' implying intricacy or ambiguity; 'fathom,' implying depth of thought; 'construe,' implying a comparison of related parts; 'turn the attention,' 'give heed to,' *animadverto*, etc.

After quoting another passage from my article, in which I referred *verstehen* and *understand* to my class 2, Prof. Hempl says:

"In this I do not agree with Prof. Wood. German *verstehen* and English *understand* are cases of class 1, not of class 2, and so is Greek ἐπιστάμαι."

And yet Prof. Hempl in his class 1.—'gather,' 'intelligo,' 'understand,' explains *understand* as I did.

Continuing Prof. Hempl says:—

"OE. *understandan* was originally simply 'to stand between,' and so 'to keep apart,' 'to separate,' and it, like Lat. *distinguo*, German *unterscheiden*, etc., got the figurative meaning 'distinguish,' 'make out,' 'understand,' 'know how (to)' (and in German, *unterstehen* passed on to 'undertake (to),' 'presume (to)'). But the

same is true of German *verstehen*, OE. *forstandan*. These originally meant 'to stand in front of,' 'to keep off (from some one else),' 'to separate,' and hence 'to distinguish,' 'to make out,' 'to understand.' Just so, Greek *ἐπίστημι* *ἐπίστανται* originally means, as still shown in *ἐπίστημι ἐπίστανται*, 'to stand in front of,' 'to oppose,' 'to check,' 'to keep off.' Hence the meaning 'to separate' and metaphorically 'to distinguish,' 'to understand,' 'to know how,' as shown in *ἐπίστανται*.

Let us once more examine *understand*, *verstehen*, *ἐπίστανται*. For OE. *understandan* Prof. Hempl assumes certain meanings. Now an assumption is all right provided we have nothing better. But since any given signification may develop in innumerable ways, we can never be sure of a conclusion drawn from an assumption. I agree with Prof. Hempl—or rather he agrees with me—in seeing in E. *understand* the primary meaning 'separate.' But this separation is not an 'auseinandernehmen,' but a 'zusichnehmen,' 'vernehmen.' Compare especially the following significations of MHG. *understān*: 'etwas bewahren,' 'über sich nehmen,' 'unternehmen,' 'erreichen,' 'an sich reissen,' 'entreissen' with OE. *understandan* 'take for granted,' 'assume,' 'annehmen,' 'perceive,' 'understand.' Germ. *unterstehen* carries out the idea contained in MHG. *understān*, *-stēn*, and did not pass through the meaning 'understand.' Compare Lat. *ad-sūmo*, *ad-rogo* 'take to oneself,' 'assume,' 'arrogate.'

OHG. *firstantan*, MHG. *verstān* *-stēn* 'intercept,' 'notice,' 'perceive,' 'understand,' OE. *forstandan* 'intercept,' 'understand' show the same development of meaning as OE. *understandan*. Compare OE. *under-niman* 'take upon oneself,' 'undertake,' 'take in,' 'understand,' OHG. *fir-neman* 'take away, take to oneself,' 'perceive.' (For other examples see my article in the May issue, vol. xiv, 1899, of MOD. LANG. NOTES.)

In Gk. *ἐπίστανται* Prof. Hempl assumes the development 'stand in front of,' 'oppose,' 'check,' 'keep off,' 'separate,' 'distinguish,' 'understand.' Here also we shall find it safer to confine ourselves strictly to the authentic usage of *ἐπίστημι* and *ἐπίστανται*. The former word is actually used in the sense of 'stand in front of,' 'oppose,' 'check,' but never, so far as I can find, in the sense of 'keep off,' 'separate.'

That would be expressed by *ἀφίστημι* or *διίστημι*. In explaining *ἐπίστανται*, therefore, we cannot start from the primary meaning 'separate.' To begin with, *ἐπίστανται* is not directly connected with *ἐπίστημι*, as Prof. Hempl seems to imply in giving the Ionic form *ἐπίστημι*. *Ἐπίστανται* is a compound of *ἐπί* and the unreduplicated *-στανται* (cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* ii, 889), whereas *ἐπίστημι* is a compound of the reduplicated *ίστημι*. The two verbs are of course alike in composition, but they are different in formation. We may, therefore, refer to *ἐπίστημι* in explaining *ἐπίστανται*. In the literal sense *ἐπίστημι* means, according to Liddell and Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*, 'set on,' 'set over,' 'place upon,' 'set by or near to,' and in the middle voice and the intransitive tenses, 'stand on, over, near, by,' etc. These are the regular and most frequently occurring meanings. The word is used figuratively in *ἐπίστημι τὴν γνώμην*, *-τὴν διάνοιαν* 'apply one's thoughts to, attend,' and so frequently used absolutely *ἐπιστάναι* 'attend,' *ἐπιστῆσαι τινα ἐπὶ τι* 'call one's attention to a thing.' From these uses come *ἐπιστάδων* 'attentively, earnestly,' *ἐπιστάδια* 'oversight, command,' 'attention, care,' *ἐπιστάτης* 'overseer, superintendent,' *ἐπίστανται* 'fix one's mind upon, believe, be confident of, know, understand,' etc. In the face of such evidence there need be no doubt as to the primary meaning of *ἐπίστανται*.

The development of the meaning 'turn one's attention to, give heed to' to 'perceive, understand' is a common one. Compare Lat. *anim-adverto* 'pay attention to, attend to, regard, observe, perceive, understand,' (*animus*) *at-tendo* 'give heed to, consider,' MHG. *war-nemen* 'wahrnehmen,' Skt. *cēlati* 'observe, consider, be intent upon, understand, know,' ON. *gaumr* 'attention,' Goth. *gaumjan* 'attend to, observe, perceive, see,' Goth. *sōkjan* 'seek, strive for,' Lat. *sāgio* 'perceive quickly,' and so many others.

Now it is possible that OE. *forstandan*, OHG. *firstantan*, *firstān* 'verstehen' may have meant primarily 'stand before,' and hence 'watch, observe, perceive, understand.' So Schade, *Wb.*, explains them. This interpretation I considered when writing my first article on these words. But it seemed on the whole more probable that Germ. *verstehen*, *vernehmen*, OE. *under-*

standan, *underniman*, *undergielan* all belonged to one class and were explained by OHG. *fir-neman* 'wegnehmen, in besitz nehmen, vernehmen, wahrnehmen;' and that *verstehen*, *understand* are both based on the transitive use of the root *stā-*, *stē-*, which is found by the side of the intransitive use from IE. time down to the present.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

Cornell College.

GERMAN FOLKLORE.

Neue Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Volksrätsels, von ROBERT PETSCH. [Palästra: Untersuchungen und Texte aus der deutschen und englischen Philologie. Herausgegeben von ALOIS BRANDL und ERICH SCHMIDT. IV]. Berlin, 1899. 8vo, pp. 152.

MORE than a century after Herder's statement¹ that the riddle summed up the innermost workings of a nation's mind, more than half a century after Wackernagel's well-known characterization,² the folk-riddle is coming into its own, as not the least worthy branch of the science of folklore. The monotony of these years of waiting has been often broken by the appearance of books and magazine articles which dealt in whole or in part with riddles;³ scientific description and investigation of them, however (along the line laid down by Richard Heinzel),⁴ the collection of variants by the comparative method, a consideration of the riddle's relation to the other branches of popular *Kleinpoesie*, treatment of it according to its inner and outer form,—such were utterly lacking. The reason for this is not far to seek: no collection of the larger sort was at hand, and it

¹ In *Vom Geiste der ebräischen Poesie*.

² *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, lii, 1843, p. 25 f.

³ For bibliography, cf. Wossidlo, *Mecklenburgische Volksüberlieferungen*. I. *Rätsel*. Wismar, 1897, pp. 259-271.

⁴ Which method in another place (*Herrig's Archiv*, cii, 1899, p. 400) Petsch characterizes as sober, cautious scientific investigation, contrasting it with

"the walthalla-drunk, myth-scenting, phantastical ravings of the last, dwarflike followers of Jacob Grimm, of whom Moritz Haupt prophesied, that there would soon be no crowing cock and no stinking goat, in which they would not discover a Germanic god."

Mr Gummere rightly refers to Jacob Grimm as "the thrice-battered" (*Old Engl. Ballads*, xlix).

was, not until the year 1897 that Wossidlo's book furnished partial foundation for such consistent and searching investigation.

This book contains two thousand one hundred and forty-one riddles, collected for the most part from the lips of the people. Such astonishing abundance of material furnishes convincing proof of the vigorous imagination, the keen observation of nature, the sound philosophy, and the indestructible humor of the people.⁵ Wossidlo's collection is the basis of Dr. Petsch's study.⁶ As there is no correspondingly large South-German collection, Renk's *Volksrätsel aus Tirol* (*Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde*, v, 1895, pp. 147-160) is used. Other collections are frequently cited for comparison.⁷

Petsch would divide all riddles into two classes: 1) Real riddles; that is, those whose purpose is to paraphrase an object by clothing the description of it in a veiled poetic dress, intended to stimulate thought, or even—it may be—to confuse it: which object may be guessed from the statement of its appearance, its origin, its activity, etc.; 2) Unreal riddles; that is, those which defy guessing, but in which the questioner generally has the intention to give the solution himself: these take advantage of the listener, try to tease him, and are, therefore, just because the solution is impossible to the uninitiated, not real, but rather unreal riddles. This division of Petsch's is exact, trustworthy and important, because investigation has been hitherto content to class all riddles as 1) Rimed Riddles, 2) Prose Jestling-Questions (*Scherzfragen*).

⁵ Cf. Hauffen's review in *Euphorion*, v, p. 735.

⁶ A companion book to Wossidlo's in importance and interest is Pitre's *Indovinelli, dubbi, scioglilingua del popolo siciliano* (=Biblioteca delle tradizioni popolari siciliane, xx), 1897.

⁷ But rarely is the title of these cited works given anywhere in full: one is compelled to guess which book is meant. For example, 'Chambers' is Chambers, *Popular Rhymes of Scotland*, Edinburgh and London, new edition, 1870; 'Gregor' is Gregor, *Notes on the Folklore of the North-East of Scotland*, (Folk-Lore Society, Publ., vii) London, 1881; etc. Frequent misspellings of proper names cause confusion: I note as wrong: Wonste (p. 56), Frieschbier (17), Doornkaat-Krolman (54), Petor (89), Giananandrea (52), Schmeller (112), Rachholz (73), Rochholtz (62), and others. To quote Dr. Petsch's own words (*Herrig's Archiv*, cii, p. 403): "Such discrepancies should surely be removed, else what is the editor there for!"

According to Petsch's distinction, then, the unreal riddles fall into four subdivisions: a) Wisdom-Tests; b) Criminals' Riddles (*Verbrecher-, Halslösungsrätsel*); c) Jestling-Questions; d) Enigmatic Tales (*Rätselmärchen*),—these last-named placed with the unreal riddles chiefly on account of the prose form in which they are cast. These four he treats first, in order to clear the path for the real riddles. Except for the manner of their division, there is little new or original in the discussion, which is, however, generally pertinent and often interesting. One *ex-cathedra* statement would seem better omitted; namely (p. 14), that the Englishman is more conversant with holy scripture than is the German, because he hears a passage from it read every Sunday, and that therefore (!) the Englishman loves to deal with biblical riddles such as the one of Lot's grandchildren:

Two brothers dear,
Two sisters' sons are we,
Our father's our grandfather,
And whose sons are we?

This riddle, Petsch says, is conspicuously rare in Germany. Is it, I ask, conspicuously frequent in England? Its source is doubtless in the Talmud (*Midras Mishlae*) where the Queen of Sheba propounds it:⁸ *Femina dicit filio suo: pater tuus erat pater meus, avus tuus erat maritus meus; tu es filius meus et ego sum soror tua.*

The second part of Dr. Petsch's study is devoted to the real riddles. It opens with a discussion of the relation between *Volkslied* and *Kunstlied*, which, as Prof. E. H. Meyer suggests,⁹ younger *Volkslied*-students might well take to heart; but Petsch goes on to discuss the *Volksrätsel* and the *Kunsträtsel* with less success. Is it necessary to burden the budding philology of the riddle with these misunderstood terms? Wossidlo avoided the breach by putting in a group by themselves (13th group) the popular riddles (*Volkstümliche Rätsel*) which, though written in the popular tone, are of recent, conscious, imitative origin; but Petsch meets us boldly on the quicksands where others fear to tread, upholding the

⁸ Cf. Friedreich, *Geschichte des Räthsels*. Dresden, 1860, p. 98 f.

⁹ *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 12. Aug. 1899, col. 1249.

specious *distinguendum inter et inter, Volks- and Kunst-*.

Berger called attention some years ago to the confusion invariably caused by the employment of catch-words, showing how fetichism followed.¹⁰ He said:

"It is the acknowledged fatality of so-called catch-words, that they obscure and even gradually come to falsify the conception of the nature of the phenomenon which they characterize; possessing, besides, a tenacity of life which is wont to outlive a surprising length of time the historical moment whence they are sprung and in which they once found their justification. Two catch-words of this kind which have current authority in the sphere of letters, and have created sad confusion on account of the merely formal contrast in which they have been handed down are: *Volksdichtung* and *Kunstdichtung*."

It is impossible, of course, for the modern literary critic to rid himself of a terminology which has so long dominated tradition, and the arbitrary and meaningless classification of all German lyric poetry into *volksmässig* and *kunstmässig* must remain in force until the millennium, and even (probably) after that. It is one thing, however, to bear with philosophy the mistakes of an honored and honorable past: it is quite another thing to view with equanimity of spirit this attempt to stamp upon the study of a recent branch of folk-poetry investigation an outworn and hollow title. *Volkslied* and *Kunstlied* must be accepted, *Volksrätsel* and *Kunsträtsel* need not be. Where is the end? *Volksmärchen* and *Kunstmärchen*, *Volks Sage* and *Kunstsage*, *Volksmythen* and *Kunstmythen*, *Volks Sitte* and *Kunst Sitte*, *Volksbrauch* and *Kunstbrauch*, *Volksbuch* and *Kunstabuch*, *Volks Spruchwort* and *Kunst Spruchwort*—we have heard of the *Volksprache*, too: now for the *Kunstsprache*.

Dr. Petsch divides the *Rätsel* into *Volksrätsel* and *Kunsträtsel* and establishes the distinction—how? Not through a study of the sources of the *Rätsel* (p. 46), or by a comparison of the spirit which animates it, but (p. 47) through a comparison of the difference in style between the folk-riddle and its art-counterpart. As an example of the former he chooses a short Mecklenburg riddle (with its Scotch var-

¹⁰ Arnold E. Berger (Bonn), *Volksdichtung und Kunstdichtung*. Nord und Süd, Jahrgang xvii, p. 76 ff. January, 1894.

iant), as an example of the latter a riddle of Schiller's. The first two are conveniently found to be brusk, monosyllabic, dialectic, contenting themselves with a sentence of description: Schiller on the contrary is found to be diffuse, polysyllabic, literary, spending himself in similes.

In like manner Wackernell¹¹ contrasts the Hessian folksong *Die Kindesmörderin*¹² with Schiller's song of like title, with exactly the same results as above: the one is found to be artless, immediate in effect, relying upon a score of broken words; the other offers the reader "the entire graduated scale of a psychological study."¹³

Vigorous protest may be entered against the unfairness of such a method. If all *Volks poesie* were as condensed as the two examples quoted, and all *Kunst poesie* were as diffuse as these two songs of Schiller's—well and good. Such is, however, not the case. Sometimes the *Volkslied* is garrulous, while the *Kunstlied* is monosyllabic. And why (except as a matter of undue zeal) choose in each case as the representative of the *Kunst dichtung* just Schiller, a poet who was as acknowledgedly, consciously free from the *deutschvolkstümliche* striving of his time as was Grillparzer?¹⁴ Suppose one were to choose as examples the *Volkslied*, *Röslein auf der Haide*, and Goethe's *Kunstlied* of like title. Such choice would lead (it has led¹⁵) to no clear result. It would be manifestly unfair.

The undeniable value of Petsch's book lies in its ingenious and helpful characterization of the *Volksrätsel*, its skilful analysis of the

component parts. The normal riddle falls into five elements:

- 1) Introductory frame-work (*Einführendes Rahmenelement*).
- 2) Denominating core (*Benennendes Kernelement*).
- 3) Descriptive core (*Beschreibendes Kernelement*).
- 4) Intercepting core (*Hemmendes Kernelement*).
- 5) Concluding frame-work (*Abschliessendes Rahmenelement*).

Technical and vague as such nomenclature appears at first blush, an example serves to make the division clear:

- 1) In meines Vaters Garten
- 2) Seh ich sieben Kameraden,
- 3) Kein ein,¹⁶ kein Bein,
- 4) Kann niemand erreichen.
- 5) Wer dieses kann raten,
Dem will ich geben einen Dukaten.

It would lead us too far to follow Petsch into the details of his further work, which deals with the minuter points of his classification. Each point in his subdivisions is illustrated by one or more riddles, chosen generally from the German, but not infrequently from the English (Scotch), French, or Italian. Never completing, but always fresh and suggestive, the chapters on the technique of the riddle will furnish a welcome starting-point for future investigation, which will come to the front more rapidly now that a beginning has been made. Valuable are the two appendices, the first of which brings a reprint of the *Rocken-Büchlein*, the second offering hints as to the editing of people's riddles.

Carelessness in spelling is visible throughout the book. Mistakes such as Hätzleim (Hätzlerin), gelegent- (gelegentlich), and p. 9; step (steps), 22; spell (tell), 37; coup (cup), 37; castlewa' (castle wa'), 39; I'me (I'm), 39; with' (wi'), 48; Widerpruche (Widerspruche), 49; allisterierend (allitterierend), 52; ridde (riddle), 52; hieizu (hierzu), 55; a (at), 57; trough (through), 17, 112; fehst (feast), 57; einc (eine), 59; the' (there), 60, 109; no omitted after *ye'll*, 62, 127; yon (you), 64; bach (back), 80; up (at), 81, 113; and omitted after *dike*, 88; Poiton (Poitou), 92; Mank (Mark), 93; preusisch

¹⁶ "That is, *Eichen Bein*, on account of the inner rime with *ein*, developed from *Buchen*. The verse may have been originally: Kein Buchen, kein Eichen, kann niemand erreichen" (Petsch).

¹¹ *Das deutsche Volkslied*, 1890, p. 18.

¹² Büchel, *Volkslieder aus Oberhessen*, 1885, No. 54.

¹³ Suppose, for the sake of analogy, the investigator in English balladry should choose to compare the "popular ballad" *Sweet William's Ghost* with Pope's "artificial ballad" *Rape of the Lock*!

¹⁴ Cf. *Jour. Germ. Philol.* ii, p. 307, note 4.

¹⁵ Despite the exertions of von Biedermann, *Zu Goethes Gedichten*, 1870, p. 9 f.; Suphan, *Archiv für Literaturgeschichte*, 1876, v, p. 84 f.; Baier, *Das Heidenröslein*, 1877, ii, p. 124 f.; Dunger, *Archiv für Literaturgeschichte*, 1881, x, p. 193 f.; Redlich, *Herders Werke*, 1885, xxv, p. 680 f.; von Biedermann, *Goethe-Forschungen*, N. F. 1886, p. 331 f.; Minor, *Chronik des Goethe-Vereins*, v, 10-11.; Moleschott, *ibid.*, p. 36 f.; Hildebrand, *Zs. f. d. d. Unterricht*, iv, 1890, p. 147 f.; Dunger, *ibid.*, p. 338 f.; Erich Schmidt, in the *Berliner Gesellschaft f. d. Lit.*, 1894, June 24th; Joseph, *Das Heidenröslein*, Berlin, 1897 (cf. M. Koch, *Litter. Centralbl.* 1898, No. 40), etc.

(preussisch), 104; threet (thread), 117; zweu (zwen), 123; personifihiert (personifiziert), 124; to (too), 127; wite (white), 135; etc., are too frequent to be excusable. Double spellings such as Herwarar, (3); Herwarar (91); Wälsch- (127); Welsch- (108), etc., might have been avoided by more careful proof-reading. *U* is often used for *n*; three times on p. 118 alone. It is but fair to acknowledge, however, that misspellings are very apt to occur when the quotations are in as many languages and dialects as are Dr. Petsch's.

Of the positive value of the book as a whole there can be no doubt. It is broad in view and instructive.

PHILIP S. ALLEN.

University of Chicago.

OLD FRENCH LITERATURE.

Li Livres du Gouvernement des Rois, a Thirteenth Century French Version of Egidio Colonna's Treatise *De Regimine Principum*, now first published from the Kerr MS., together with Introduction and Notes and full-page Facsimile, by SAMUEL PAUL MOLENAER, A. M., Ph. D., Instructor in the University of Pennsylvania; sometime Fellow of Columbia University. New York: published for the Columbia University Press by The Macmillan Company, 1899. 8vo, pp. xlii and 461.

THE *Livre du Gouvernement des Rois et des Princes* (for so the work carefully styles itself) is a prose version of the Latin prose tractate *De Regimine Principum* by Egidio Colonna, who died in the office of Archbishop of Bourges, in 1316. This well-known Latin work was compiled by Egidio (who was known in France as Frère Giles de Rome) for the instruction of the dauphin, who afterwards was known as Philippe le Bel. Soon after his accession in 1286, this prince commissioned a certain Henri de Gauchi, a canon of St Martin's at Liège, to make a version of the work in the vernacular.

Of Henri de Gauchi's work there exist perhaps a score of manuscripts; one of these, to which attention has already been called in this journal,¹ is preserved in a private library in New York City. Dr. Molenaer's work con-

¹ Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. xii (1897), cols. 399-400; S. P. Molenaer, *A Manuscript of the Gouvernement des Rois*.

sists in a diplomatic reprint (one page to one column) of this manuscript, with introductory matter, numerous emendations to the text (use being made of the Latin original), together with notes and appendices. The text itself amounts to upwards of sixteen thousand lines, occupying four hundred and twenty-one pages. It will be seen that the preparation of this bulky and handsomely printed volume has involved no mean amount of labor and care.

The work is dedicated to the editor's instructors, Profs. Cohn and Todd, and we can but heartily welcome this evidence of a fruitful growth in the study of Romanic philology in the United States. Dr. Molenaer has set himself a high standard, and his work will undoubtedly, as he hopes, prove of interest and value to many besides students of the beginnings of pedagogy and political science. While the following remarks bear exclusively on the linguistic side of the work, I have not forgotten that perhaps the chief interest aroused by this publication will be among workers in other fields.

Considering the length of the text printed, one is reluctant to find fault with the editor for not adducing any of the other French manuscripts for comparison, helpful as this would have been in many an obscure passage. The editor states (p. xxviii) that

"our text has one feature in common with several of the manuscripts described in M. Lajard's article;² namely, the omission of Chap. 23, Book iii, Part ii."

When a hint of this kind is given, it is unfortunate if it cannot be followed up carefully. Not only, in this case, would the value of the text have been enhanced by the removal of obscurities, but a comparison with these more nearly related manuscripts might also have settled the question of the dialect of the original French version—a question to whose solution the editor can bring only surmises and probabilities. On this point, he supposes that Henri de Gauchi wrote "in a Picard dialect, most probably the Artesian," and he suggests, though he does not make, a comparison of the text with those of the *Vie de St. Alexis* (only Manuscript S could be meant), the *Aucassin et Nicolette* (this, by the way, should not be called

² *Histoire littéraire de la France*, Vol. xxx, p. 421.

a "poem") and the *Dit dou Vrai Aniel*, especially the last, as being contemporaneous.

This question of the dialect seems to me to merit a somewhat closer examination, even though, in the single manuscript before us, the material may be very scanty. I may say at once that what evidence the manuscript contains seems to me to show that the original dialect was not Artesian, nor even Picard, but rather belonged to the Eastern group, and was, most probably, the Wallonian. The fact that Henri de Gauchi was a member of the chapter of St. Martin's at Liège furnishes an indication that should not have been ignored, and a far more fitting, because more promising, comparison might have been made between what seem to be the older linguistic features of the Kerr manuscript and the language of the six *chartes* coming from this very collegiate chapter of St. Martin's, and published in *Romania*, Vol. xvii, by M. Wilmotte. These range in date from 1272 to 1286, coming thus within a few years of the date of Henri de Gauchi's commission (soon after 1286).

The editor, however, does not let his view go entirely unsupported. In the chapter on the linguistic features of the text, he lists a dozen "specifically Picard features." Among these I can find only one (Latin CA=*ca* not *cha*) which, if proved, would confine the text to Picard territory; the remainder are either common to the whole North and East, or, as in the case of *cen=ce* (pronoun) and the syncopation of *l* (*acun, defat*) point strongly toward Eastern territory. The position of Liège on the border of the *ca*-territory renders the presence of a few forms like *cascuns, castiaus, caitif, cauz, CALCEM* (*capitre* is learned, hence to be excluded) a matter of little surprise: the same orthography is found occasionally in the *Dialogues* of Pope Gregory, and in documents in the dialect of Liège.³ Nor is it certain that *gambes* represents a different pronunciation from *iambes*.⁴

The Kerr manuscript shows evidences of a general rejuvenation of the language (*aus* for *as*, *lui* for *li*, *garde* for *gart*, etc.); in the fourteenth century copy or copies, the dialectic

³ See Behrens, *Unorganische Lautvertretung*, p. 38.

⁴ See Suchier, *Auc. u. Nic.* 3, § 12; Wilmotte, in *Romania*, Vol. xvii, § 28.

coloring imparted by Henri de Gauchi must have been already mostly removed, for few pronounced traits of any sort remain to serve as sure guides. Of these, however, the most constant are as follows (the editor, I should state, also noted nos. 1-5, 8, 14, 16, 17, but without text references):

1. Parasitic *i*: *aveir* AVARUM 16.37 (I refer by page and line); *penseies* 20.15; *espeie* 323.8, 375.16; *meir* (?) 410.30 (MS. *mur*); *pluis* 26.7, etc.; *suis* 32.35; *juistes* 48.40, etc.; while *ei* is wider spread, *ui* is confined to the East: *soit* (*sol*) 329.4 is probably only an error.

2. *-are>-ier* in *alier*, etc.; *siet* SAPIT 72.31; *hiet* 96.25; *trief* 110.25; *aviers* 130.9; *piere* PATREM 164.3; *siet, tiel, quiel*, etc., etc. In all except the last two examples, the presence of *ie* for *e* is explained by the reduction of *ie* (arising under Bartsch's Law) to *e*, beginning in French of the Centre in the fourteenth century, and the consequent confusion of the two orthographies. *ie* is even introduced in *departient* 154.32; *sormontient* 92.4; *mentient* 127.35; where *tient* (*tenir*) is perhaps responsible. As for *tiel*, it is common, for example, in Joinville (Champagne dialect).

3. *ie>i*. *-ie* for *-iê* -ATA; *sicle* 18.26, etc.; *eslive* 213.30; *assegir* 405.32. The reduction is well known in Wallonian⁵ and in Lorraine.⁷

4. *ie* in *terre, gierra* 278.16 is not specifically Picard.⁸ *aniaus* 411.24; *ruissianz* 414.4, are found also in Eastern monuments.⁹

5. For *ø* tonic, there is nothing conclusive: *boens, passim; vult, vnelt, velt; joennes* and *jennes; avegle*. Interesting are *juient, JOCANT* 60.30, and *juiz, JOCOS* 41.37. *eu* for *ui* is well-known; the inverse is rare.¹⁰

6. Pretonic *o>e*: *quemun* 3.22; *hennneur* 3.26, etc.; *quenoist* 319.4. Known in the East¹¹ and elsewhere.

⁵ Cf. Suchier in Gröber's *Grundriss*, § 38.

⁶ Wilmotte, *l. c.*, § 8.

⁷ Apfelstedt, *Lothringische Psalter, Einl.*, § 11. See also Logie, *Transactions M. L. Assoc.*, vol. vii, p. 110.

⁸ See *Auc. u. Nic.*, § 22; *Vie de St. Alexis*, p. 269; Wilmotte, *l. c.*, § 11.

⁹ See Apfelstedt, *l. c.*, § 26.

¹⁰ See Apfelstedt, *l. c.*, § 72, where *lui* for *leu* is quoted from a text in the dialect of Metz.

¹¹ See Apfelstedt, *l. c.*, § 50; Wilmotte, *l. c.*, § 23.

7. *ei>oi* after labial: *moine* (*mener*) 21.36, 408.20; *poine* 346.37. So in the East.¹²

oe for *oi* in *voer* (*voir*) 31.7, 31.16, 55.18; *rasoer* 375.19; and perhaps *oie* in *purvoier* 261.14, seem to correspond to the *valoer*, *savoer*, *avoer* and *avoier* of the Liège chartes.¹³ The latter also have *saen*, *faet=sain*, *fait*, with which compare *mesaese* 130.19.¹⁴

8. The distinction between *-z* (= *ts*) and *-s* is wholly lost: examples on every page. So in Wallonian, from the middle of the thirteenth century.¹⁵

9. Final *-t* disappears: *devan* 113.2, etc.; *enten* 322.38; *secré* 331.14. So in Wallonian.¹⁶

10. Syncopation of *l* in *acun(e)* very often, corresponding to the *achon* (*ch=k*) of the Liège chartes. In Picard, *lis* vocalized.¹⁷ Less certain are *defat* 9.23; *nus* 10.31; *vuet* 98.32.

11. As in the East, *lr*, *nr* remain in *chauroit* 199.18; *covenroit* 275.37.¹⁸ No assimilation in *donront* 19.10; *menroient* 317.39.¹⁹

12. *on* for *un* in *chascon(ne)* frequently, as often in the Liège chartes.²⁰ Not confined to the East.

13. *nn*, *mm*, as in *chasconne* 30.24; *ordeinne* 47.28; *Romme* 326.12, appear constantly in Wallonian.²¹

14. *-aule* *-ABILEM* in *honoraules* is also good Wallonian.²²

15. *w* to suppress hiatus: *lower* 19.23, 25.24; *jower* 91.18, 91.27. So in the Eastern documents.²³

16. In the morphology, we note the pronoun *lie* for *elle*: 23.29, 167.24 (at 148.4 *lie* stands for *lui*). This rare form, with which may be compared *mie=mi* 404.21, appears, also as feminine, in one of the chartes²⁴ from Andenne, near Namur.

17. We come to the demonstrative *cen* (*a cen que*, *por cen que*, etc.), whose regular employment is a marked peculiarity of the Kerr manuscript. *n* and *u* are so constantly confused in the writing of this manuscript, that at

¹² See Apfelstedt, *l. c.*, § 33. ¹³ Wilmotte, *l. c.*, § 13.

¹⁴ Wilmotte, *l. c.*, § 5. ¹⁵ Wilmotte, *l. c.*, § 35.

¹⁶ Wilmotte, *l. c.*, § 33.

¹⁷ Apfelstedt, *l. c.*, § 80; Wilmotte, *l. c.*, § 36.

¹⁸ Wilmotte, *l. c.*, § 42. ¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ Wilmotte, *l. c.*, § 21; cf. note, p. 558.

²¹ Wilmotte, *l. c.*, § 43; Apfelstedt, *l. c.*, § 95.

²² Wilmotte, *l. c.*, § 32.

²³ Wilmotte, *l. c.*, § 31; Apfelstedt, *l. c.*, § 78.

²⁴ *Romania*, vol. xix, p. 94, ll. 5, 25.

first I was inclined to see in the nearly constant *cen* a misapprehension for *ceu*, the latter well-known in Lorraine and Wallonian. The writing *cè* 381.35 is not conclusive, being due to a later hand; *ce* occurs sporadically (cf. the facsimile). The history of *cel* and *ço* presents much difficulty,²⁵ but, for this text, I see no objection to placing *cen* by the side of *ken=ke*, *quen=que*, *chen=che* (*ce*), *chon=cho*, as found in the Liège chartes studied by Wilmotte.²⁶

To resume, while there appears to be no trace of several traits which we might look for in a Wallonian text (*astoit=estoit*; *wardeir=guarder*; *-ëllum>-eal*, etc.), yet it is also true that we have met with no marked peculiarity which excludes the region of Liège; on the other hand, the testimony in favor of Artois is, plainly, very weak. However, as has been intimated above, a comparison with the other French manuscripts can alone decide the question with certainty.

The transcription of the text seems to have been made with fidelity. Page 3, l. 11, the facsimile has *ce* (not *cen*). Page 3, foot-note, we are told, "in words marked * the final letter is written on an erasure." Later, however, the asterisk evidently refers the reader to the Notes. It would have been more prudent not to uniformly replace *u* by *v*, as to do so involves a decision of some very doubtful questions. Thus *jover* 214.1, *lover* 257.13, can hardly be justified, while *ensinez* 3.16, *eschiner* 11.12, *ueenes* 17.19, should not have been condemned without basis. The use of the diæresis is not always consistent.

A partial reading of the text has suggested the following observations:—

5.1; 200.7. The mysterious *semitis*, *semites* is probably *services*= 'duties'; the confusion is easily possible.—9.41 read *esmueve(nt)*.—10.10 better a *qu[o]i*, cf. 18.32.—14.5 read *qu'i[l]*.—18.15 read *meësme[me]nt*, as elsewhere.—31.10 read *empeëschie*s (not *-iës*).—40.14 *tens a venir*, as 42.9.—41.33 *a[s] vaines choses*.—45.13 fem. participle needed.—47.31 read *soustien[en]t*.—48.2. The editor *defaille*, the manuscript *devoie=desveier*, 'dérouter,' 's'égarer.'—62.30 *apaië* is very doubtful; be-

²⁵ See, especially, G. Paris, in *Romania*, vol. xxiii, pp. 173-174.

²⁶ Cf. *l. c.*, § 41; for *ceu*, cf. *Romania*, vol. xix, p. 80.

sides, the fem. is necessary.—86.37 *meïne-ment*.—97.17 *volent* is, perhaps, connected with the rare adj. *vuele*;*²⁷ or is it from *ouel* ÆQUALEM (19.6, 23.22, 421.31, etc.)?—111.7 rather *entent*, as 100.24.—111.9 read *celi* for *li*.—113.22 ff. keep to the manuscript and read: *celes sont douces* [*qui sont douces*] *a ceus qui sont heitiez et ont le goust bien disposé*, etc.—129.16, 133.6, etc., *oient* is altogether wrong; elsewhere the editor has correctly *oient* (131.24).—132.25 if the restoration of -s is undertaken at all, *remez* must be *remes* (*remeses*, l. 34).—151.16 keep to the manuscript: *commant* is correct for Pres. Sbj. 3; so *parlons* 232.10, and *gart* 188.37.—173.21 no need to change *sont* to *set*; cf. 174.1.—202.24 no need for change.—216.34 *crest* in manuscript is good; *nest* is quite unsatisfactory.—250.21 *feures* FABROS seems to me unobjectionable.—272.32 *demosterons* need not be changed.—277.20 better *quid(er)oit*.—323.9 is incomprehensible to me.—325.27 *quen* in manuscript seems to stand for *qu'en=qu'il*. Cf. *eus* for *ils* 19.13.—326.20 *l'use* for *lime* in manuscript is unnecessary; insert [*le*].—338.12 *pleideier* is found by the side of *pleidier*.—378.18 *l'ame de son cors=de soi-même* and need not be changed.²⁸—404.32 *estou[i]ent*. The insertion of *i* only increases the confusion. For -*ient*, see § 2 above. Read *estuet*, or *estoet* (impersonal verb). So 303.24.—410.2 read *leveiz* as 409.31.—410.4 *fouir* *FÖDIRE is very good; the editor himself lets it stand at 413.13.—411.10 *feut* in manuscript is excellent; *foit*, which is substituted, could be only perfect, hence *foit*, as in the *Cambridge Psalter*, vii, 15.—417.32 *out* should be *out=UNDE*.

Notes, p. 432, l. 3, *ardaument*: it is a question whether -*amment* ought not to be read in all these forms.—434, l. 10, *felle* of the manuscript is no doubt *feble=DEBILEM* in the Latin.—434, l. 32 read *li hons ne se meut en son corage*.—436, l. 32, *aage* was fem. in the sixteenth century, so here. Cf. 169.15.—437, l. 25 *oënt*: such a reference seems to me useless.—437, last ll. I doubt if Schwan is so easily corrected. For *foir*=FUGIRE, cf. Behrens, *Unorganische Lautvertretung*, p. 34, and cf. 350.40.—443, l. 6, *asaülès*.—443, l. 14, *maignent* seems to be *main-ent* (*mancir*); but the glossarist mistook it for

meinent—moinent (*mener*).—448, l. 35, *requerent* in manuscript seems to be an error for *re-content*, spelt *requentent*. Cf. above, § 6.—450, l. 14, *chascuns* for *Caton*, at first sight, points to *CA>ca* (not *cha*) in the original text; but *ch=k* is a not uncommon orthography in the Liège chartes, as *achon=alcun*.

T. ATKINSON JENKINS.

Vanderbilt University.

BEOWULF.

Notes on Beowulf. By THOMAS ARNOLD, M. A. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1898. 8vo, pp. 140.

The Tale of Beowulf sometime King of the Folk of the Weder Geats. Translated by WILLIAM MORRIS and A. J. WYATT. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1898. 8vo, pp. x, 191.

Tales of the Heroic Ages: Siegfried, the Hero of the North, and Beowulf, the Hero of the Anglo-Saxons. By ZENAÏDE A. RAGOZIN. Illustrated by GEORGE T. TOBIN. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. 8vo, pp. xxii, 332.

ARNOLD'S *Notes* will prove a valuable help to English and American students of the epic of *Beowulf*. While similar books¹ have appeared from time to time in Germany for almost the past twenty-five years, England and America have published nothing of equal importance on *Beowulf* philology. True, there is little new light offered on any of the obscurities of the various *Beowulf* questions. In fact the author disclaims at the outset any serious attempt at original views.

"The object of the present 'Notes'," he says (p. 2), "is to do what I think has not yet been done: namely, to place before the English reader the present position of Continental and British opinion on the leading *Beowulf* questions. To propose or enforce any views of my own, except to a very limited extent, and then chiefly in connection with the authorship, has not been attempted."

The larger part of Arnold's book is devoted to the examination and elucidation of the theories and opinions of Müllenhoff and Sarrazin. Moreover

¹ Cf. Müllenhoff's *Beowulf*, and Sarrazin's *Beowulf Studien*, two of the most important.

²⁷ Bartsch and Horning, s. v., *Lothr. Ps.*, note to § 72.

²⁸ Cf. Tobler, *Verm. Beit.*, vol. i, § 6.

"the language of the poem, the nature of the story and of the episodes contained in it, the allusions to historical events, dynasties, tribes, and individuals, the date, the authorship, the possible transformations,"

are all briefly discussed. There are, very properly, few attempts at the interpretation of doubtful words or disputed passages. And while the author agrees with Sarrazin in his general theory of a Scandinavian home and original for the English *Beowulf*, he frequently takes issue with the German critic in the matter of details, and does not hesitate to repudiate the latter's somewhat *aus der Luft gegriffene* theory of the Cynewulfian authorship of *Beowulf*, as well as of *Andreas* and *Gudlac*.

The Frontispiece to the book is a map. "The Geography of *Beowulf*," showing the, in many cases supposed, location of the places and tribes mentioned in the poem.

The Contents are conveniently arranged into nine divisions or chapters, with an "Index" appended. As the Table of Contents contains a brief outline of the subject-matter, a repetition of it here will give a sufficient idea of the scope of the book and of the character of the discussion:

- I. Object of 'Notes'—Language of the poem West-Saxon—Compared with that of Chronicle *A*—Scandinavian element—Diction compared with the Homeric.
- II. Analysis of *Beowulf*—The question of interpolations—Müllenhoff's view—Episodes—1. Fin and Hnæf—2. Wars between the Swedes and the Geatas—3. Ingeld and Freawaru.
- III. *Beowulf* a Dano-Geatic legend—Allusions in it to Denmark—Anglen—To the Geatas or Goths—Heorot and Leire—Queen Wealhþeow—Sigemund and Here-mod—Offa and Anglen—The Geatas.
- IV. Allusions to other peoples and tribes—The Heaðobards—The Brondings—The Gepidæ, etc.
- V. Allusions connecting *Beowulf* with the Nibelungen Lay.
- VI. The Geography of *Beowulf*.
- VII. Scandinavian sources—Starkad—Use by the poet of his materials.
- VIII. Date of composition—Authorship of the

English poem—Müllenhoff's 'atheteses'—How far reasonable—Different theories considered—Parallel passages in *Beowulf* and the Cynewulfine poems compared—Parallel passages in the *Andreas* and *Beowulf*—in *Gudlac* and *Beowulf*—Priority and originality of *Beowulf*—Authorship of the Epos unknown.

IX. Mythological theories.

On the similarity of diction between *Beowulf* and the Homeric poems, and the importance of this similarity in placing the date of the composition of the poem, Arnold remarks (pp. 10-12):

"In a poem of known late date, such as *Byrhtnoth*, written about the end of the tenth century, the definite article is employed much more frequently. Again, the boasting of the Homeric heroes is curiously paralleled in *Beowulf*, especially in the passages where he sets Hunferð right as to the swimming match which he had with Breca. . . . There is also a Homeric colour about the descriptions of arms, houses, clothes, etc., in *Beowulf*, proceeding not, of course, from direct imitation, but from parity of social circumstances and ruling ideas. That native and fresh delight with which in the Homeric poems mention is made of everything made or used by man, as if the sense of the human initiative were a recent and delicious perception, and the mind were only beginning to become conscious, and to take pride in the consciousness, of the inventive skill of the race, is largely found also in *Beowulf*, and that to a degree not equalled by any other Anglo-Saxon poem. . . . The student of *Beowulf* will, the closer becomes his acquaintance with the poem, be more and more firmly convinced that it represents a very early stage of Anglo-Saxon culture."

While he agrees with Sarrazin* in laying the scene of the story "in the Danish islands, Gotland or Gautland, the southern province of Sweden, and the seas between them" (p. 13), Arnold does not seem to believe in the latter's views of the identity of Heorot "with Lethra and its temple of worship."

"If," he says (p. 41), "Heorot be identified with Leire, then the same place which, in *Beowulf*, the most ancient authority, is represented as the creation of a Danish king, and in every sense Danish, must be regarded also as the capital of the Heaðobards, whom both Müllenhoff and Sarrazin believe to have been a *Germanic* people. Heorot, therefore, cannot be identified with Leire."

* *Beow. Stud.* p. 4 et seq.

3 *Anglia* xix, 368 et seq.

It is further suggested (p. 42) that Leire could not have existed in the time of Hroðgar, otherwise it would have been mentioned along with Heorot in *Beowulf* or in *Widsið*, the most ancient sources we possess. In another place (p. 82) Arnold says,

"the view of Sarrazin and Danish scholars that the site of Hroðgar's mansion must be placed in close proximity to that of Leire, near the head of the Røskilde Fiord in Zealand, is now generally accepted."

He also rejects *in toto* (p. 83 *et seq.*), the opposite theory of Bugge⁴ that Gautland is identical with Jutland, and that, therefore, the Geatas and Jutes are one and the same people.

From meagre references in the poem itself, the author concludes (p. 111)

"*Beowulf*, as we know it, was composed within the period 568-752. From this interval the first hundred years may be deducted, partly to allow for the lapse of time since the hero's burial, partly because Anglo-Saxon culture, before the arrival of Christianity, and without some previous literary practice, could not have been equal to such a task. . . . This deduction made, the upper limit of time within which *Beowulf* was probably composed, becomes 670, and the lower limit 750."

As to the interpolation theories of Müllenhoff and others,

"the lines 1725-1769—" he says (p. 113), "a moral discourse put into the mouth of Hroðgar in continuation of his remarks comparing *Beowulf* with Heremod, are generally allowed to be an interpolation. Comparing 107-114 and 1262-1267, passages both of which refer to Cain, and speak of him as the progenitor of monsters, there seems much reason to think that one of them must be interpolated. The dull and unnecessary passage 3039-3076 is more likely to have been the addition of a stupid copyist than the work of the original writer. Many other passages we should be inclined to sacrifice to Müllenhoff's strictures, if only the least fragment of additional evidence were forthcoming; as it is, it appears preferable to accept the text on the whole nearly as it has come down to us."

The author still holds partially (cf. pp. 114-115) to the theory advanced in the Introduction to his edition of *Beowulf* (1876),

"that both the choice of subject and the grade of Culture which are met with in *Beowulf*, might be connected with the missionary efforts of the English Church of those days to extend Christianity in Friesland and farther east. . . . It does not appear improbable that it was in

⁴ Cf. *Beitr.* xli.

the interest of the spread of Christianity that the composer of *Beowulf*, perhaps a missionary, perhaps a layman attached to the mission, was attracted to the Scandinavian lands; that he resided there long enough to become thoroughly steeped in the folklore and local traditions; that he found the grand figure of *Beowulf* the Geat predominant in them; and that, weaving into an organic whole those which he found suitable to his purpose, he composed an Epic which, on his return home, must soon have become known to all the lovers of English song."

Such a theory naturally brings him to a consideration of Sarrazin's⁵ attempt to identify "this hypothetical poet" with "the celebrated Cynewulf." On this point Arnold is "unable to share his (Sarrazin's) opinion;" and after quoting several of the parallel passages between *Beowulf* and *Crist*, *Beowulf* and *Juliana*, *Beowulf* and *Elene* which are pointed out by Sarrazin,⁶ he says (p. 119): "In all but one of these passages the priority of the *Beowulf* poet, and the indebtedness of Cynewulf, appear to me indisputable." Again, he says (p. 120):

"Although the evidence of the parallel passages which have been examined appears to tell strongly, on the whole, for the originality and priority of the *Beowulf* writer as compared with Cynewulf, yet, if the style of the latter poet, estimated by means of the work certainly his, bore a manifest resemblance to that of the Epos, the theory of the identity of Cynewulf and the last interpolator of *Beowulf* might not be without its attractiveness. But no such resemblance exists."

Arnold further expresses the opinion (p. 123)

"that the writer of *Andreas* was not Cynewulf, but that, like Cynewulf, he was a firm admirer of *Beowulf*, and borrowed from it many phrases and locutions;"

and he thinks *Guðlac* "was probably written by a Croyland monk, and not later than about 740." There is

"no reason for assigning it to Cynewulf. . . . The tone is grave and pious, but not at all excitable, the morbid and introspective tendency of Cynewulf is wholly absent. That the author was well acquainted with the *Beowulf*, and composed his poem later, may be considered certain."⁷

Comparatively little space (four pages) is devoted to the numerous "Mythological⁸ theo-

⁵ *Beow. Stud.* 123 *et seq.*

⁶ *Ibid.* 110 *et seq.* cf. *Engl. Stud.* xxiii, 227 *et seq.*

⁷ Cf. pp. 123-127.

⁸ Cf. Siever's on *Mythus u. Sage in Beowulf u. Saxo*, in *Berichte der königl.-Sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften* (1895) p. 175 ff.

ries" which have been associated by German and Scandinavian scholars with the *Beowulf* epos. This and the general tenor of the author's remarks would seem to indicate that he attaches very little importance to the attempts of recent German and Scandinavian critics to build up various Norse mythological theories from the vague hints in the poem itself.⁹ He emphasizes the fact (pp. 141-2)

"that the great ruling myths which governed the Northern mind at the time when the Scandinavian saga¹⁰ was composed, are, if not passed over in silence, yet very faintly shown in *Beowulf*. There is no mention of Woden, Frey, Thor, Balder, Frigga, Loki, or any other of the popular divinities. The great 'doppel-mythus,' as Sarrazin calls it, in which Balder and Frey, Siegfried and Gunther, Tristan and Mark, seem to belong to the same chapter of old nature-worship, finds nothing in *Beowulf* to correspond to it."

The new edition of Morris's translation of *Beowulf* is merely a reprint of the Kelmscott Press edition of 1895. Although the first edition was published four years ago, the expensiveness of the book and the small number issued, made it from the beginning all but inaccessible to students and admirers of *Beowulf*. In fact, if *Beowulf* students in this country did not happen to read the excellent review of the book in the *Athenaeum* for August 10, 1895, its existence was probably for the most part unknown. This new edition will, therefore, be especially welcome to every one who is interested in this remarkable poem, and who is not so fortunate as to possess a copy of the original edition.

William Morris has, it seems to me, combined in his version of *Beowulf* two essential features of every really great translation in verse. He has successfully (for the first time in the case of *Beowulf*) imitated the metrical form, and reproduced as far as it is possible, the spirit of the Old English original. The rugged vigour, the healthy imagination, and the general epic tone of the original are all found in Morris's translation. Until I had read Morris's version I was a strong advocate of the

irregular, four accent lines,¹¹ with Cæsura, and without any effort at the preservation of the alliteration, as the best modern verse-form for Old English poetry. And unless the translator be a sympathetic, "inspired" poet, such as William Morris was, he cannot use the alliterative line with effect, while he may be able to make the irregular line of four accents more interesting to one who is reading for the thought of the poem. Such a reader will also get more of the spirit and atmosphere of the original from the smoothly flowing irregular line of four accents, because the alliterative line of itself, if not infused with the breath of inspiration, is too apt to attract the attention of the general reader to its outward form: the strongly accented alliterative syllables, which when *continuously* used, are totally foreign to the genius of modern English poetry. The fact that all modern English poets occasionally employ alliteration in order to produce some extraordinary artistic effect, does not indicate a tendency toward alliteration in modern poetry.

A literal reproduction of both the verse-form and the matter of the original may fail to transmit the spirit. Prof. Fulton¹² truly says

"a translation which does not seek to reproduce the manner as well as the matter of its original cannot, of course, give anything like a true and adequate idea of that original."

And the stress that has been placed upon the literal reproduction of matter and form at the cost of that of manner or spirit is the chief defect of most of the modern versions of *Beowulf*. But the ideal metrical translation must have a sympathetic, comprehensive, inspired translator, who by the magic touch of genius is enabled to subordinate the matter and form of the original to, and infuse them with, the spirit of true poetic feeling.

Morris's translation will hardly attract the general reader, and it was evidently not intended to serve as a college text-book, because the author uses too many obsolete and archaic words. Now and then one comes upon

¹¹ Employed by Prof. Jas. M. Garnett in his meritorious translation of *Beowulf*.

¹² *Publications Mod. Lang. Assoc.* xiii, p. 289. For extended discussions of the "Translation of *Beowulf*," Cf. among others, Gummere, *Amer. Jour. of Philol.* vii, p. 46 et seq.; Garnett, *Publications Mod. Lang. Assoc.* vi, p. 95 et seq.; Stopford Brooke, *Early English Lit.*

⁹ Cf. especially Sarrazin, *Beow. Stud.* p. 47 et seq. Niedner, *Die Dichtungen im Beowulf*, 2fd. A. 42, 229 f.

¹⁰ Arnold sees no reason for holding with Sarrazin (*Beow. Stud.*, 92 f., *Engl. Stud.* xxiii, 250) that Starkad was the author of the original Norse *Beowulf* epos (cf. p. 102 f.).

clauses and lines that are about as difficult to interpret as the original, for which even the brief vocabulary of "some words not commonly used now" does not always give sufficient help. On the whole, however, the translation of Morris gives the beauties of the original, and spirits the reader away to the romantic days of Hroðgar in Heorot and Hygelac in Geatland as no other modern version, now in existence, will do. The critic in the *Athenæum*¹³ says:

"We can well imagine that this translation of 'Beowulf' into rhymeless alliterative lines will seem uncouth to the general reader whose ear is familiar only with the quantitative scansion of classic movements and the accentual prosody of modern rhyme and Blank verse. But if the business of the translator of an ancient poem is to pour the old wine into the new bottles with as little loss as possible of the original aroma, Mr. Morris's efforts have been crowned with entire success. . . . So powerful is the vision at work in this glorious poem, that it seems the product not of a poetical artificer, but of Nature herself. . . . The last crowning excellence in all poetry is that it shall seem to be inspired, and one of the greatest aids to this is that the struggle between matter and form shall be so little apparent that the movement seems the inevitable outcome of him who tells the tale or sings the song."

Ragozin's *Beowulf, the Hero of the Anglo-Saxons*, is contained in the last one hundred and odd pages of the book. The story is in no sense a literal translation of the original, although the narrative is frequently interspersed with passages translated into simple, easy prose. These "Tales of the Heroic Ages" are avowedly written for the entertainment and instruction of the young, between the ages of ten and fifteen, but the *Beowulf* might be read with great interest and profit by "grown up" people; or even by students and critics of the Old English epic. The main outline and facts of the poem are given in such easy-flowing, vivacious prose, that the reader experiences in its perusal all the pleasure of a novel or fairy tale.

The interest of the story is very much increased by four splendid illustrations from the adventures of the hero, Beowulf; namely, The Death of Beowulf (Frontispiece); The Landing of Beowulf; Queen Wealhtheow Pledges Beowulf; Beowulf and the Old Wife of the Mere.

WM. H. HULME.

Western Reserve University.

13 August 10, 1895.

FRENCH GRAMMAR.

Grammaire historique de la langue française.

Par KR. NYROP, Professeur à l'Université de Copenhague. Tome premier. Copenhague: det Nordiske Forlag. Leipzig: Harrassowitz. Paris: A. Picard & Fils. 1899. 8vo, pp. xi, 488.

WE are at last to have a measurably complete French historical grammar written, not by a Frenchman it is true, but at least in French. If we must again postpone the realization of our hopes for Mr. Gaston Paris' *Grammaire de l'ancien Français*, which is to solve for us so many questions reserved from time to time in *Romania* for a more convenient season, we take great satisfaction in having before us the work of one of that large band of scholars who have received from him their inspiration for Romance studies.

Prof. Nyrop's grammar is a striking evidence of the constantly increasing importance which the scientific study of the Romance languages is attaining. It will be when completed by far the most compendious historical grammar of a single Romance language, this first volume containing four hundred and eighty-eight pages as against two hundred and seventy-one in the Schwan-Behrens grammar, although the latter treats phonology and morphology, while the former does not include the morphology. A comparison of Part II., 'Phonétique,' in Nyrop's work with Part I., 'Lautlehre,' of the Schwan-Behrens, which is a fairer test, shows two hundred and ninety-four and one hundred and twelve pages respectively.

The contemporary form of the language is chosen as the standpoint for considering the alteration of Latin into French. The plan may well be defended, since Modern French is for us the most important stage, and, in large measure, the cause of our interest in those which preceded; yet it may be questioned whether Old French is not the true vantage position, from which, as middle ground, we can best look back to the Latin and forward to the Modern French. No such hesitation, however, need be felt in commending the author's use, wherever practicable, of the Classic form of Latin words when citing etyma. It is true that prominence should be given to the fact that such form is frequently not the basis of the French word, and, it may here be remarked, Prof. Nyrop might to decided advantage have laid more stress on the difference between

phonetic modifications which took place in the general Folk-Latin stock and those peculiar to Gallic territory; but, nevertheless, the Classic Latin furnishes the form more familiar to the student, and if the main laws which worked in the popular speech be emphasized, he quickly learns to make for himself the most of the alterations in the correctness of which we have confidence; while the attempt to clothe every word in a Folk-Latin dress is bound to result in erroneous, and liable to result in ridiculous, forms.

Part I. of the volume, 'Histoire générale de la Langue française' treats in separate chapters the origins, the general history, and the external characteristics of the language in the Old, the Middle, the Classic, and the Modern period, and, in conclusion, the orthography. The material, wisely chosen and well arranged, is presented clearly and attractively, and forms an admirable introduction to the study of French historical grammar.

Part II., 'Phonétique,' evidences no less distinctly the author's orderly bent of mind. He has distributed his material into chapters in a form convenient for both study and reference. The chapter devoted to each vowel treats only the 'unconditioned' development of that vowel in free and in checked tonic and subtonic position. Then separate chapters are devoted to the disturbing influence of palatal consonants, labial consonants, *l*, and *r*, after which atonic vowels are grouped together. Syncope and its opposite, dieresis, hiatus, and apophony, or vowel alterations due to accent-shifting, are treated in the closing chapter on vowels. The main division of the subject of consonants is based on their mode of formation and not on their position with regard to surrounding sounds, so that the plan of arrangement employed for the vowels is reversed. The concluding chapters of the work are concerned with general phenomena disturbing the working of phonetic laws, as dittology and haplology (better known to most of us as assimilation and dissimilation), popular etymology, etc.

The bibliography of 46 pages is quite detailed, but needs to be supplemented in some cases by the use of that of Schwan-Behrens; over which, however, it takes decided precedence in convenience of arrangement. Some

of the books and articles cited might, in view of the author's 'but surtout pédagogique,' have been omitted as not calculated to add to the student's stock of accurate information. It is to be regretted that Prof. Nyrop did not adopt one of the standard systems of abbreviation for the titles of journals and collections, either that of the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* or that of the *Kritischer Jahresbericht*, but here, and elsewhere, the book shows a tendency rather away from than toward German influences. The closing pages of the grammar contain an analytic index, and a word-index apparently complete.

There is evidence of a careful and extensive use of the valuable *Dictionnaire général* of Hatzfeld, Darmesteter, and Thomas as the chief authority in etymologies and word-forms. In fact the whole trend of the work shows the influence of the French school, the author's opinions on grammatical questions coinciding largely with those of Mr. Paris. The nature of a handbook such as that before us precludes exhaustive discussion of original views, yet there are points which are presented in a way to furnish interesting food for reflection. The absence of certain of the details of date and process of development may be justified by Prof. Nyrop's 'ordinarily excluding all doubtful opinions,' yet this test can hardly have been applied to some that are admitted. A valuable feature of the volume from the pedagogical standpoint is the fulness with which examples of learned forms are cited under each subdivision. On the other hand, a number of details given in the phonology belong more properly to morphology, and unnecessary repetition would have been avoided by reserving them for the second volume. Phonetic terminology is so complicated and conflicting that the first care should be to do nothing to add to the confusion. Why then call all syllables before the accent 'protonic' instead of, with Darmesteter and Meyer-Lübke, limiting the term to the syllable immediately preceding it? Again, does it help the already sadly befogged nomenclature of palatals to use the name 'prepalatal' for a palatal before *e*, *i*; medio-palatal for a palatal before *a*; post-palatal before *o*, *u*? Taken as a whole, however, the book is a model of clearness, showing in this one of the most salient

advantages of the influence of the *esprit français*. We have the implied promise that the succeeding volumes will treat morphology, syntax, and semantics.¹ We thank the author for the portion of the grammar which has already appeared, and shall await with eagerness the remaining parts.

A few comments on individual points are appended.

§ 20. The author makes the surprising assertion that in Old French there occur no learned adjectives or verbs. How would he explain such words as *entuminescent* (Roland, l. 535), *violé* (id., 704), *penser* (id., 1472), *criminel* (id., 2456), *principal* (id., 3432), etc.? If his statement is intended to refer only to the examples he has cited, it is, to say the least, misleading.

§ 111. "Si *b* devient *v* dans HIBERNUM > *hiver*, on trouvera que le même changement a eu lieu dans tous les mots où *b* se trouve dans la même situation, c. à d. précédé et suivi d'une voyelle."

The last phrase in its present wording is incorrect. An intervocalic labial is not in the same situation when followed by a back vowel as when followed by a front vowel: cf. *TABONEM > *taon*, DEBUTUM > *deu* with DEBERE > *devoir*.

§ 113.3. *Pouvoir* < *poir* is incorrectly cited as an example of the development of a new sound. It is an analogous formation; cf. Z. R. P. XI, pp. 538-539.

§ § 127-128, 148-149. Folk-Latin lengthening of free tonic vowels is not asserted, and by implication is rejected (cf. § 128, first sentence). Even if the author, as here indicated, follows Boehmer, a theory so generally accepted and of such basal importance as ten Brink's should at least be mentioned. As Prof. Nyrop does not draw this quantitative distinction; he naturally holds (§ 171) that *e* < free *a* was distinguished from *e* < checked *ε* or < checked *ε* not by its length but by its quality. He does, however, questionably suggest (§ 181) a difference in quantity between Old-French *o* < checked *o* and *o* < free *o*.

§ 149. To state that a vowel which is followed by a single consonant, as in NOS, TRES, is in an open syllable serves, it is true,

¹ Cf. § 515, rem., § 519, rem.

as a practical rule, but misleads and confuses the student. It should be explained that a vowel in this position would be free or checked according to the nature of the initial sound of the word which follows, but that the cases where it was free prevailed over the others. This is a section in which the author is forced to choose between conflicting theories and his choice is to consider that *cr* and mute-*l* constituted checked position. He avoids the further problem that is offered by *poêle*, PENSILE, by omitting the word altogether.

§ 164. It is surprising to see it suggested in explanation of the diphthongization of the vowel in *vieil*, *siècle* that the date of the fall of the *u* in VETULUM, SÆCULUM, was later than the diphthongization of *e*. From the days of Schuchardt's *Vokalismus* on, no one has questioned the antiquity of the absence of the *u* in the combinations *chil*, *tül*. Farther on in the same section MELIUS and VENIAM are given as examples of words having a checked tonic vowel (cf. also § 207). While it is customary to consider *ly* and *ny* as checking combinations, yet to do so raises serious problems, both because of the history of preceding *e* and *o* and because of the early passage of *ly*, *ny* to *mouillé* *l*, *n*. Prof. Matzke's view accords better with the principles of syllable division.

§ 183. The suggestion that the passage of free *o* to *ö*, instead of being similar to that of *e* to *oi*, resembles that of *u* to *ü* is interesting, and at least worthy of further investigation.

§ 214, *cas isolés*. *Moindre* is erroneously treated as having a checked tonic vowel.

§ 231. The sub-heads are incorrectly numbered.

§ § 209-232. The chapter on nasals is well arranged and very clear. The author follows Mr. Paris' theory, accepting the preservation of all nasal consonants in Old-French pronunciation (§ 332) and rejecting the nasalization of any vowels except *a* and *e*. The only qualification he makes is in § 213 (cf. also § 218), where he says: "La nasalization (of *i* in *in*), si elle a existé, a été très peu sensible": but cf. § 225: Tout *o* devant une nasale était fermé et oral, and § 227: "Au moyen âge *bruns* et *uns* assonaient avec *plus*, *fut*, *vertut*. . . : donc, *u*

² Publications of the Mod. Lang. Association, vol. xiii, pp. 27-31.

était plutôt oral." The arguments of Herzog for the pre-literary disappearance of nasal consonants when in the same syllable as the preceding vowel, and therefore for the nasalization of all vowels in Old-French, have brought new and important support to the theory of Prof. Suchier, which should by all means be mentioned.

§ 250. To consider mute *e* in final syllables a supporting vowel in all cases in which it does not represent Latin *a* is not satisfactory, as Prof. Meyer-Lübke has pointed out.

§ 253 (p. 210, last line). Mute *e* in Modern French 'ne s'entend jamais en prose dans les mots isolés ou avant une pause.' Probably *que* is omitted after *prose*, but in any event the statement is too sweeping.

§ 261,3. So far as the history of the language as shown by its monuments is concerned, *ço*, *cest*, etc., are as old as *ïço*, *icest*. Why not explain the one set as tonic, the other as atonic forms?

§ 348,2. What indications are there that double *l* and simple *l* had different values in Old-French pronunciation? Again, the assertion is made in § 466 that the writing *ss* denoted a true double consonant in Old-French. It is probable that its meaning as a graphic sign was the same then as it is now.

§ 371, *cas isolés*. The fall of *p* in **SAPUTUM* is rightly classed as not phonetic, but attention might have been called to **HABUTUM* > *en* as having caused the fall of the consonant in *sen*.

§ 378. The author adopts the view of Prof. Thurneysen that the point of departure for the loss of the *b* in the Imperfect was *HABEBAM*, *DEBEBAM*, in which the *b* fell by dissimilation. This does not seem, as an unsupported explanation, sufficient. Prof. Lindsay's suggestions of proportional analogy to the Future is worthy of consideration. In early Latin *ibo* is found by the side of *iam* in the Future of IV, and *ebo* by the side of *am* in the Future of III. Thus, as the Future had forms with and without *b*, the Folk-Latin Imperfect may have had a form without *b* parallel to the form with *b*.

§ § 471, 208. The *Pal.+a* theory of the

3 Z. R. P., vol. xxii (1898), pp. 536-542.

4 Z. F. S. L., vol. xv, part 2, pp. 90-91. Cf. also Rydberg, *Die Entstehung des r-Laut*, Upsala, 1896, p. 46; Staaf, *Revue de Philologie française et de Lit.*, vol. xi (1897), pp. 27-31.

5 *The Latin Language*. By W. M. Lindsay, Oxford, 1894, p. 493, § 37.

development of *ARIUM* is adopted, but without comment or exposition. In § 208 the student may be in doubt whether *-ier* represents the uniform development of *ry* or not, while the statement in § 471 that *ry* 'se combine en un *r* mouillé, qui se résout en *ir*,' with the citation side by side, in illustration, of *PARIA* > *paire*, *-ARIUM* > *-ier*, is most confusing. *-ARIUM* might have at least been put down as a '*cas isolé*.'

§ 400, 2, *rem*. If the development of words in *-ICUS* is 'peu clair,' the difficulty does not lie in the contrast shown in the two sets of words given, for this is due to the *t* of the first set being in weak, and the *t* of the second in strong position.

P. 406. For 415 read 451.

In the sections called '*cas isolés*' more suggestions as to the cause of the variations from regular development might easily be given and would be servicable to the beginner. Some examples of this lack have already been mentioned, and a few others will be added here. The list could be extended. § 379,2. The student should note that in *coulon*, *plon* the *b* which fell was final and followed an *m*. § 382,2. A beginner might not see the bearing upon these words of the late fall of protonic vowels or of the preceding sonorous consonants. The same explanation is needed also in § 400, 2; § 401, 2; § 403, 2, *cas isolés*. The cases in the sections cited might have been contrasted with those in § 390, *cas isolés*, in order to bring out the fact that, for a consonant resulting from the fusion of a secondary combination there is regressive assimilation in place of formation, progressive in mode of formation.

§ 399, *cas isolés*. The words in which *cr* > *gr* all have *cra*. § 399, *rem*. The difference in time between the reduction of *qu* to *k* in *quand* and *quinze* is not mentioned, and attention might have been called to the cause of the reduction in *QUINQUE*, etc.

EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG.

Johns Hopkins University.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Lessing's Minna von Barnhelm, edited with an Introduction and Notes by A. B. NICHOLS. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1898.

THIS text-book, which comes from its publishers as a most attractive and handy little

volume of only one hundred and sixty-three pages all told, commends itself in both Introduction and Notes for a sensible discrimination between what is wanted and not wanted by its presumable users.

The Introduction contains a clear, succinct and condensed exposition of the historical background of the play, its composition and production, its dramatic structure and literary significance.

The text is adorned with reproductions of twelve etchings by Daniel Chodowiecki, Lessing's contemporary. They represent the most prominent scenes of the play and are interesting as illustrating the costumes of the time. Nor is a characteristic portrait of the poet as a frontispiece wanting.

The Notes, written for students of an intermediate stage, are rather abundant, and are accompanied by a running comment on the action, the plot and the characters of the play. As he mentions in his preface, the editor has given special attention to the turning of the idiomatic particles so ubiquitous in the text and so troublesome even to the advanced student. And nowhere, indeed, is help more necessary and more legitimate than just here, where even the most voluminous dictionaries discourage consultation. The furnishing of this much-needed help is, therefore, a real merit of Mr. Nichols' edition. It would have been preferable, however, to avoid all repetitions of one and the same note, on a *doch* or a *ja* for instance, and to substitute for them references or—what is far better still—queries, which stimulate the student to do his own thinking. Most of the editor's renderings of the idiomatic particles are unimpeachable; only the following are recommended for reconsideration:

To page 3, line 10. *Nur in ich muss nur bald meinen Herrn aufsuchen* does not mean 'just,' but emphasizes *ich muss* and answers to 'by all means.'

To p. 25, 11. *Ja in man traue doch ja seinem Herzen nicht* is not to be rendered by 'you know'; it strengthens the negative *nicht* and *ja nicht* means 'not on any account.'

To p. 32, 22. *Doch in Doch, Herr Wirt; das haben Sie nicht gut gemacht* does not

mean 'yes,' but is adversative: 'say what you please, Mr. Landlord, you did wrong.' *Doch* may, to be sure, as the note says, be used colloquially for 'yes,' but only where a preceding negative statement is to be refuted, as on p. 70, 1 in *Doch, Franziska, wir wären allein*, which refutes the preceding *wir sind nicht allein*.

To p. 33, 3. *Ja in Ich sage Ihnen ja* is better rendered by the adversative 'but' than by 'you know.' This adversative *ja* is very common in dialogue; cf. Goethe's *Faust*, I. 1765: *Du hörst ja, von Freud' ist nicht die Rede*.

To p. 33, 13. *Wohl in ein Wirt hat sich wohl in acht zu nehmen* does not imply 'as you may conceive,' but simply stands, as often, for *sehr*: 'a landlord has to be well on his guard.'

To p. 36, 6. The statement '*doch*, where it does not affect the order, is a weak adversative=*aber*, though not incorrect, is misleading, inasmuch as the same adversative *doch* may very well affect the order: cf. *doch ist es jedem eingeboren* (Goethe). *Doch sollst du* does not differ in meaning from *doch du sollst*, to which passage the note just quoted refers. The note ought to read: '*doch*, at the head of a clause, is always adversative.'

To p. 39, 1. *Ja wohl in ich will es ihm ja wohl sagen* is not covered by 'just.' It qualifies *ich will* and is used by Just to emphasize his half-reluctant, half-nonchalant compliance with Franziska's request: 'I don't say that I will not tell him (by and by).'

To p. 40, 26. *Wohl in ich verstehe mich wohl selbst nicht* does not mean 'in truth,' but 'very likely.'

To p. 54, 22. 'Ever' seems to be a misprint for 'even.'

As to the rest of the notes, very little requires emendation:

To p. 13, 7. In *Equipage qu* is not sounded like *k*, but like *kv*.

To p. 24, 12. The note '*nichts weniger*, anything but' ought to read: '*nichts weniger als*, anything but.'

To p. 67, 27. *Blutarm, blutjung*, etc., with the intensive *blut-*, never have the accent on the first syllable, at least when used predicatively. *Blutarm* means 'anæmic.'

If the writer were permitted to enumerate all the notes that are particularly helpful and

all the renderings that seem to him especially felicitous, the list would be very much longer than that above.

H. C. O. Huss.

Princeton University.

A GROUP OF OLD AUTHORS.

A Group of Old Authors. By CLYDE FURST, Lecturer for the American Society for the Extension of University Teaching. Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs & Co., 1899.

MR. FURST has gathered into an attractive volume five lectures to popular audiences, hoping, as he says in his preface,

"to add to popular knowledge of older European literature by giving detailed illustrations of its condition at several periods between the sixth and the seventeenth centuries."

Mr. Furst need hardly have entertained the fear, which he intimates he felt, that the unfamiliarity of his themes might deter the reader. His essays could hardly fail, even upon a cursory examination, to attract those they were designed primarily to reach, or to prove, upon further acquaintance, both interesting and stimulating. Even those who approach them with some previous knowledge may find their profit in the careful and conscientious treatment, which their subjects receive at his hands.

The first paper, "A Gentleman of King James's Day: Dr. John Donne," treats of the life of the great Dean in its relation to his works, with an examination of the diverse opinions passed upon his verse. As the title indicates, the paradox in Donne's life is brought out, by which, though seemingly unfitted by birth, training, tastes, and a somewhat wild and idle youth, for the profession James forced upon him, he could yet, in so surprising a way, justify as well by practical piety and good works as by his eminence as a preacher, that wise and foolish monarch's insistence. Mr. Furst holds so closely to his main purpose, the exposition of the intimate relation between the events of Donne's life and the substance of his verse, that one misses those picturesque details with regard to Donne's personal peculiarities, which make so much of one's impression of

him as derived from Walton's inimitable biography. It is wise to make little of these, perhaps, for they might serve only to accentuate that first (and erroneous) impression the reader is apt to receive from his verse, that it is curiously bizarre, eccentric, and obscure, and that only. It is much better, no doubt, to emphasize, as Mr. Furst does, the sterling traits of Donne's character and the real virtues of his verse,—its depth of thought, sincerity, emotional intensity, and its noble, though broken and irregular, music.

The papers which follow, "A Mediæval Love Story" (Patient Grissel) and "The Miraculous Voyage of St. Brandan," are studies in comparative literature, sufficiently comprehensive in their inclusion of the various versions, well ordered, simple, and clear. Each story has a charm and appeal of its own, and both are well adapted to enforce the point the author no doubt had in mind—one new to the general reader and most interesting—the way in which a story is found diffused through the whole range of mediæval literature by borrowing and adaptation, and that miracle of persistent vitality, natural enough in a way but always stimulating to the imagination, by which it reappears again and again in various literatures and at various periods even to modern times.

The two remaining papers are drawn from an earlier time. The subject of "An Anglo-Saxon Saint" the life of Aldhelm, and the culture and scholarship of the monasteries in England in the seventh century is almost entirely novel, as a theme for popular presentment. Mr. Furst succeeds in making the actual Aldhelm real to the reader, while not omitting the quaint and delightful legends that associate themselves with his name. He gives an adequate idea of those works of Aldhelm's that remain to us in their cryptic mediæval Latin, and of their scope and purpose, including the famous Riddles, as compared with the Anglo-Saxon collection. Mr. Furst, by the way, unhesitatingly refers to the Anglo-Saxon Riddles as Cynewulf's—and surely, as regards some of them at least, no one will dispute the assumption, if there is any virtue as evidence in a universally acknowledged "moral certainty." Mr. Furst deplors the loss of Aldhelm's works in the vernacular, and justly contends that he must have had an

important influence upon the development of Anglo-Saxon verse.

The concluding paper upon *Beowulf*, which perhaps in concession to its importance Mr. Furst styles "The Oldest English Poem," provides an abstract of the story with such explanatory material in regard to the time and place of its composition and the various conditions determining the character of the early epic, as may enable the student to read the poem with better understanding and increased enjoyment.¹

A feature worth noting of these essays is the care displayed in respect to the citation of approved critical authorities. Mr. Furst has been almost too assiduous in this regard, if that were possible, but they are introduced skilfully in such a way that the essays in no case fail to convey a distinctly personal and individual impression. The volume will undoubtedly be welcomed by those who listened to the papers when they were delivered as lectures, and by reaching a larger audience in their present form will, it may be hoped, perpetuate and extend the influence which it was the aim and inspiration of those lectures to exert toward winning the student and general reader to unfamiliar fields of English literature, and literatures related to it.

CLARENCE G. CHILD.

University of Pennsylvania.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TOMAR LAS DE VILLADIEGO.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In the *Notes*, Vol. xiv, columns 516-517, Dr. Charles Carroll Marden publishes an interesting note upon the colloquial Spanish expression *tomar calzas de Villadiego* which, as far as known, occurs for the first time in the

¹ The author desires the insertion of a note in connection with this review to the effect that he

"regrets not having noticed that in this concluding paper, during its years of growth and revision as a lecture, the marks of several quotations from Mr. Stopford Brooke's *Early English Literature* had become neglected."

Celestina (Act xii.) "The origin of the expression," he says, "is an unsettled problem."

An article¹ by Benito Mas y Prat giving a satisfactory theory of the origin and history of this phrase was published in the *Almanaque de la Ilustración* for 1890. Its substance is as follows.

The origin of the expression is historical. During the thirteenth century the persecutions of the Jews reached such a pitch of barbarity, that Ferdinand III., not wishing to break entirely with this rich and prosperous people, took measures for their protection. By a privilege granted in 1223, and given in full by Benito Mas as found in the *Memorias para la historia del santo Rey*,² he took under his protection the Jews of Villadiego near Burgos.

Some years prior to the granting of this privilege, the Lateran Council, for the better separation of the two races, had decreed that the Jews should wear garments distinct in form and color from those of the Christians. This distinguishing color was probably yellow, as that had been recommended for this purpose in the Bull of Paul IV.

Now the *Celestina* says definitely that the *calzas de Villadiego* were to be taken at the first sound of alarm. "Apercíbete á la primera voz que oyeres á tomar calzas de Villadiego." This advice would fit admirably the case of those Jews who, living in Burgos and wearing in spite of the regulations the ordinary clothing of the Castilians, were suddenly obliged to flee from impending persecution. In such an emergency they could dress themselves in the garments that showed them to be protected by the King's privilege and retire for safety to Villadiego.

The expression as found in the *Celestina* must therefore be construed as meaning originally: "to get under cover, to seek shelter;" later it was often used, as it is at the present time, to mean: "to leave hastily," "to run like forty."

CAROLINE B. BOURLAND.

Bryn Mawr College.

¹ Not mentioned by Vñaza, *Biblioteca histórica de la filología castellana*, 1893.

² Compiled by Burriel (see Amador de los Rios, *Hist. Crit. de la Lit. Esp.*, Vol. iii. p. 435, note 1). The original privilege seems still to exist (see Amador de los Rios, *Hist. de los Judios en España*, Vol. i. p. 357, note 1).